



Albert Olmstead
The Age of Sargon II

OZYMANDIAS PRESS



VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.com



Albert Olmstead
The Age of Sargon II

OZYMANDIAS PRESS





Albert Olmstead
The Age of Sargon II

OZYMANDIAS PRESS



The Age of Sargon II

Albert Olmstead

OZYMANDIAS PRESS

Thank you for reading. If you enjoy this book, please leave a review or connect with the author.

All rights reserved. Aside from brief quotations for media coverage and reviews, no part of this book may be reproduced or distributed in any form without the author's permission. Thank you for supporting authors and a diverse, creative culture by purchasing this book and complying with copyright laws.

Copyright © 2016 by Albert Olmstead

Interior design by Pronoun

Distribution by Pronoun

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE SOURCES

ACCESSION

BABYLONIA AND SYRIA

THE NORTHWEST FRONTIER

THE ARMENIAN WARS

THE MEDIAN WARS

THE ELAMITISH WARS AND THE CONQUEST OF BABYLON

THE LAST YEARS

THE CULTURE LIFE

THE SOURCES

THE RESURRECTION OF THE Assyrian world and the discovery of Sargon are synchronous. Prior to 1843, when Botta made his first excavations, it was no exaggeration to say that "a case scarcely three feet square enclosed all that remained, not only of the great city, Nineveh, but of Babylon itself". When that scholar left his consulate at Baghdad to excavate in the huge shapeless mound of Khorsabad, a new world came into being. A new people and a new language, new customs and a new art, surprised the world; and Sargon, thus far known only by a single reference in the Bible, suddenly took his place by the side of Cyrus or Croesus as one of the great monarchs of the ancient Orient.

The first efforts of Botta were confined almost entirely to the securing of bas-reliefs and inscriptions. A later expedition, led by Place in 1851, yielded a less rich booty of such finds, but, by the careful uncovering of the whole palace mound, gave us what is still the best plan of an Assyrian palace. Another expedition, though adding nothing to our Assyrian material, gave Oppert an opportunity of studying the inscriptions and remains in situ. Thus for a considerable period, Sargon and his works were the most important matters Assyriologists had for discussion. But as new sites were excavated and new documents were found, the interest gradually shifted to other fields where more hope of startling discoveries was to be had. And, indeed, there is little reason to look for many new historical documents of Sargon's reign being found; for the palace he built has been thoroughly excavated and most of the other places he occupied have been more or less fully explored. From the philological side there is no likelihood of great change, and the standard edition by Winckler is nearly final.

But though there is little call for a re-editing of the texts, two causes make a re-writing of the history very necessary. On the one hand, a large amount of new material has become available. This is not, of course, to any great extent of a historical nature. But in the wealth of letters, charters, business documents, and other material of this sort, we are not so very differently situated from the historian of Mediaeval Europe who uses the same kind of documents to check and amplify his chronicles.

But even more important is the change in our attitude toward these sources. We no longer are content with a collection, however

exhaustive, of the material. We must first criticize our sources and then interpret them, not only in sympathy with the past, but with special reference to the historical demands of our own day. Let us see how all this affects our estimates of these inscriptions.

At first sight, nothing could be more certain than the accuracy of these sources. We have here no manuscripts corrupted by frequent copying. Our documents are originals, and, what is more, are the productions of contemporaries whose results are given us stamped with the stamp of official approval. Other reasons, no less potent though less recognized and less legitimate, were the natural prejudice in favor of the newest discoveries, especially when discovered in so wonderful a way, and the even more natural feeling of favor with which Christian men and women viewed the documents, risen from the earth, which so often refuted the over-zealous "higher critic".

Our report must be much less favorable. These records are official. In that fact lies their strength and their weakness. The opportunities for securing the truth were ample. Royal scribes accompanied the various expeditions and the archive chambers were full of detailed reports from commanders in the field. But, like all official records, ancient or modern, these documents have been edited to a degree of which it is difficult to conceive. A few examples may not be out of place to show how far from trustworthy they are. Sometimes a foreign source may afford the needed correction, as when Rusash of Haldia turns up safe, sound, and victorious enough to erect the Topsana stele some time after the suicide the Assyrian scribes so pathetically describe, or as when the Hebrew account declares that the leader of the Ashdod expedition was the Tartan and not the king himself, or as when from the Babylonian chronicle we learn that the victory Sargon claims to have won at Dur ilu was really a defeat. In each of these cases there was every inducement for Sargon's scribes not to tell the truth, while the foreign writers were under much less temptation.

But sometimes we do not need to go beyond Sargon himself. Out of his own mouth we may convict him of untruth. Note, for example, the three accounts of the fate of Merodach Baladan. In one he is captured. In the second he begs for peace. In the third, he runs away and escapes. Naturally, we are inclined to accept the last, and this is confirmed by the later course of events. But such an occurrence raises a doubt in our mind as to the accuracy of other cases where the official accounts do not agree among themselves. When, for instance, we have one account of the Ashdod expedition in which we are told

that Iamani was captured and another where we learn that he fled to Meluhha whence he was brought back, we are inclined to wonder if he did not really escape.

Another question and one which must affect our estimate of Sargon's character, is how far the use of the first person actually means personal command in the field. In one or two cases, where the absurdity of this would have been self-evident, due credit is given to the local commander. The use of the first person means no more than does the triumph of a Roman emperor mean that he was in the field himself. In many cases it would clearly have been impossible for Sargon to have been in widely separated parts of the empire at practically the same time. Many campaigns are too petty for the great king to have troubled himself about. Only once does the Hebrew allow us to check and then, in the important Ashdod revolt, it is the Tartan and not the king who is in command. Indeed, from the letters and the prayers to Shamash, we find that it was the exception rather than the rule for the king to war at the head of his army. In several cases it has already been recognized that we must see separate movements under separate commanders to the consequent clearing up of the history. Much must still be done along this line.

A mere reference may be made here to the exaggerated and discordant figures given in the various documents. The plea of Oriental disregard for numbers may be made, but can hardly stand in the face of the small and exact numbers of the epistolary literature. Nor should we forget the stereo-typed formulae which have no more real meaning than have the accounts of battles in Diodorus. Enough has been shown, it would seem, to indicate the care with which we must study these sources, even when their statements are not directly challenged by other evidence. Even within the official inscriptions themselves there are groups of varying degrees of trustworthiness. Unfortunately, the one least valuable is the fullest, and has, until the present, been too fully trusted. Unfortunately, too, our other evidence is of a fragmentary character and so often we must accept the version of the official inscriptions of this group or trust to mere conjecture. This group is that comprising the various documents dating from about the year 707 and coming down to us inscribed on the walls of Sargon's new capital of Dur Sharrukin. It includes the Annals, the Annals of Hall XIV, the Display Inscription, which form a sub-group of larger inscriptions, and a group of smaller ones including the Cylinders from the foundations, the inscriptions on the Bulls, the

tablets found in the foundation stone, those on the gate pavements, and those on the backs of the sculptured slabs.

Of the two sub-groups, the first is not only fuller, but generally more accurate, though there are cases where the second seems to point to a more probable situation. Of the first, again, the Annals is the most trustworthy as well as the backbone of our chronology. As compared with the other documents of the Dur Sharrukin group, details are given most fully, numbers are still fairly reasonable, and the facts seem least distorted. Yet often the four versions of the Annals differ among themselves in a most remarkable manner and in some cases two slightly differing accounts have been incorporated one after the other. The greatest value of the Annals lies in its chronology, for indeed without it we would have no solid basis for the dating of many events of the reign and no general chronology at all. Yet a careful examination of its chronological data gives an unsatisfactory impression. Under the year 710, for example, we have a brief account of the events from the accession of Merodach Baladan, while at the end of the same year we have the account of the "seizing the hands of Bel", which logically closes the Babylonian campaign, but really belongs to the following year. The section dealing with 716, as already seen, clearly contains the records of more than one year. The frontier wars were evidently chronic, yet they are forced into the chronological scheme. Nor does the scheme agree with what we find elsewhere.

It is difficult to acknowledge that the scribes of Sargon, near the close of his reign, did not know or did not care to know the real succession of affairs. The putting together of the Prism fragments has perhaps given a new point of view. In the earlier years, the date is one year earlier than that of the Annals, in the later, two years. It is simply inconceivable that in 707 the scribes did not know whether the Ashdod revolt took place four or six years before. There are two distinct systems here, one in the Annals and one in the Prism B, both probably artificial to a considerable extent. Which is more probable and to how great a degree either is true is a difficult question, but a study of the whole chronology seems to indicate that that of Prism B should be more trusted, and this seems to be borne out by a comparison of the two.

It is difficult to explain the system of the Annals from that of the Prism, but the reverse is easy. It looks a little as if there had been a break in the series of campaigns, the Assyrian Chronicle has for one

year "in the land," that is, no expedition, and that later the scribes had padded out these gaps with the events of other more crowded years. A most glaring example of the inaccuracy of the Annals is in its dating the battle of Dur ilu in 721, whereas not only the Babylonian Chronicle, but also an official inscription of Sargon of very early date assign it to 720. Again we ask: Why was this transfer and what really happened in 721? Was that year taken up with putting down revolts? The chronology of the Assyrian Chronicle belongs to a group of its own, but so far as its data can be brought into relation to the others, it rather supports that of the Prism. But, however we may distrust the artificial scheme of the Annals, we must acknowledge that the others may also have an artificial character while, as the only full and complete system, it must still be retained for at least relative chronology in so far as an artificial system cannot be detected. A very inferior version of the Annals is that of Hall XIV, which omits much and abandons the chronological order.

If the Annals had been completely preserved, there would be little use for the Display Inscription, but the former is so badly mutilated that the frequently literal quotation by the latter is often our only source. But the accounts are much abbreviated and are arranged in geographical rather than in chronological order, although chronology does play some part within these sections. Failure to understand this arrangement has led to sad mistakes, an example of which is the time-honored error which places an Arabian tribute, immediately after the battle of Rapihu, merely because the two are closely connected in this inscription.

The minor inscriptions of this group give but little that is new. There is no chronological arrangement and their variant readings, though interesting to the philologist and topographer, have but little for the historian. The Cylinders seem to be the earliest as they are the most important. In fact, so close is the agreement in places with the deed of gift document of 714 that we may postulate an earlier date for this, perhaps soon after the conquest of Babylon. For the building of Dur Sharrukin, it is our best authority and may perhaps be a source for the accounts of the others, while it is often of value for other phases of the culture life. The Larnaka stele is of interest, because it is the identical stone Sargon sent to Cyprus, as we are informed in the other inscriptions. Its text is comparatively short, but in type it agrees rather with the large than the small ones. Sometimes it gives a more likely account, as when we have the version of the subjection of

Cyprus intended for the Cypriotes themselves, or the fuller account of Hamath. Its date is about the same as that of the Dur Sharrukin group, to which it belongs in spite of its distant location.

A second group would contain the inscriptions of the two Prisms. Prism A has been fairly well studied. It gives us the well-known Ashdod revolt, the list of Median princes, and a Dalta episode. Prism B has remained largely unnoticed. The fragments have now been arranged, and large parts of four out of eight columns recovered. The results are in general disappointingly meager in all but one direction. This is the chronology which, however artificial, seems, as already noted, to be more nearly correct than that of the Annals. The two prisms, though not identical, are quite similar. They are of Annal type, though entirely unrelated to the Annals. They seem earlier than the Dur Sharrukin group, though they cannot be much older. They appear to come from Nineveh, where Sargon would seem to have resided prior to his occupation of his new capital.

Another group is that containing the more strictly chronological documents. The so-called Eponym Canon gives us the list of eponyms or *limmu*, and this bare list of names now begins to be amplified by the dated commercial documents. More important are two fragments which add to the name and office of the eponym some sort of a historical statement. One belongs to the so-called Assyrian Chronicle and covers practically the whole reign. The chronological clue has now fortunately been discovered, and it can now be utilized. The date is entirely a matter of conjecture, and its sources cannot be found in any inscriptions known to us. Its tendencies seem to be priestly, but its chronology agrees fairly well with Prism B, and it seems quite reliable. The other is not very different from this type, but its exact parallel is still to be found. Each year from 708 to 704 has several lines devoted to historical data. It has close affinities with the Babylonian Chronicle, but seems in at least one case not to have so well repeated its tradition. It has no relationship with the first fragment. Though probably late, it used good sources and seems trustworthy.

The fourth group consists of the early inscriptions. The Nimrud inscription comes from Kalhu, the early capital of Sargon. Its date is about 716. Unfortunately it is brief, and is not in chronological order. Some new facts are to be gleaned, such as the conquest of Iudu and the capture of Carchemish. A brief fragment from year six has little value, but the one from year two (720) is extremely important not only for its chronology but for the vivid light it casts on the causes of

Sargon's accession. A few other fragments are known but are either unpublished or of little importance. No affinities have been found within this group.

We may conclude our survey of the official material by mentioning the labels on the sculptures, the bricks, the inscribed fragments of pottery and of glass, and the minor building inscriptions. In some periods, all this would have great value, but so full are our sources that we rarely need their help, though the building inscriptions add to the culture history and the labels enable us to utilize the beautiful bas-reliefs which have a real historic value.

Such, then, are the official documents the king of Assyria wished to hand down to posterity. Edited though they are, a careful study may often secure the truth. Yet were we confined to these alone, our knowledge would be very one-sided, as indeed it is even now. Fortunately, we have other data. For we have, almost in its entirety, the contents of the Nineveh archive chambers, and much of the material goes back to the days of Sargon. Of the documents there found, the most important are the letters and reports. Many are from commanders in the field and throw a new light on the strategy of the times, on the foreign relations, and even on the culture life of the neighboring peoples. Others deal with domestic affairs, reports, favorable or unfavorable omens, state the health of the royal family, or merely pay their respects to their lord. Valuable as these are, it is not easy to localize them. Dates are rare; the same name may belong to more than one person; a connection with known events is difficult to find. To make matters worse, they have been until recently sadly neglected, and in consequence are still hardly out of the decipherment stage. A large number have been given in the collection of Harper, but others which seem from the catalogue to belong to our period are still unpublished. Of those published, a minority have been really studied. One group, those dealing with the events of the last few years on the northern frontier, have been already isolated and a fairly complete account can be gained from these alone. Here and there a reference may be made to a letter, but full study from the historical stand-point must be preceded by full study by the philologist. Yet, little as they have yet been used, their use has materially changed our account in places.

These letters were not the only documents preserved in the Nineveh archives, for in them were preserved all sorts of written material after that peculiarly oriental fashion which knows no

distinction between public and private, when the ruler is concerned. Even the literary texts, mostly philological or religious in character, which formed the so-called library, seem really to have been a part of this general collection. Of purely private documents there was no lack. Every business transaction, no matter how simple, must have its written voucher. Through these, the whole political, religious, social, and economic life of the people is laid bare before us. To what an extent this collection of data can be utilized for our period, the chapter on the culture history will show.

Thus far we have been discussing only the sources which give us the Assyrian point of view. We are fortunate in having records, few as they are, from the surrounding nations. Babylonia, Haldia, Judaea, and by these we can check the ones already noted.

Merodach Baladan, in spite of his long reign, prepared no war annals or, if he did, they have not come down to us. The only historical document we have is the Babylonian Chronicle. This is a fine piece of work. The author is indeed a patriotic Babylonian. But he seems to have no more bias in favor of the Chaldaean Merodach Baladan than he has for the Assyrian Sargon. In his opinion, no doubt, one was as much a foreigner and a barbarian as the other. This impartiality seems to be proved where we can test it. The date is late, perhaps in the Persian period, but he clearly used good sources.

Equally valuable is the boundary stone which gives the text of a charter by which Merodach Baladan granted a plot of ground to one of his favorites. In it he gives an exposition of his land policy. If he says that he honored the gods, we can hardly cite Sargon to the contrary, nor, if we accept Sargon's testimony to the oppression of a pro-Assyrian party by his Chaldaean rival, must we forget that the latter makes exactly the same charges against the party which held Babylonia before his arrival? Aside from these, we have only a few commercial documents of the usual sort. There are other sources which, though now in Greek dress, actually seem to go back to cuneiform originals. Berossus has a very uncertain reference to Merodach Baladan; there are references to that ruler and to a siege of Tyre which may possibly be attributed to Sargon; while Ptolemy, in his *Almagest*, furnishes us with a list of Babylonian kings and further strengthens the chronology by the mention of three eclipses.

The other inscriptional sources are few. The Haldian ones, so numerous at an earlier time, are now but a bare half dozen in number. We have building inscriptions of Rusash and Argishtish II as well as

the Rusash inscription at Lake Gokcha to show the extent of the empire. Of real importance is the Topsana stele, which sheds so much light on the truthfulness of Sargon's scribes. As for the Hittite inscriptions, we may still doubt if they have been really deciphered, and even if they have, the actual gain is small, while the knowledge that our Itamara the Sabaean may be one of the Yatha'amars of the Sabaean inscriptions, is no great advance.

Owing to their inclusion as a part of our sacred literature, the study of the Hebrew documents is one of peculiar difficulty. Those who hold the older and more conservative views have ascribed large portions of the book of Isaiah to this reign, while more radical critics have done likewise with those sections they still allow to that prophet. Be it as it may in regard to the Isaianic character of these oracles, repeated readings with this end in view have left me unable to locate with any assurance a single one in Sargon's reign.

Although the heading of the twentieth chapter of Isaiah refers to the Ashdod expedition, we are not justified in accordingly attributing the oracle itself to this date, as will be clear to any student of prophetic headings. On the other hand, the heading itself, whatever the date of its insertion, does reveal knowledge of the actual facts. We have here an excellent illustration of the fact that a very late insertion may nevertheless go back to a good early source.

The reference in the tenth chapter to the capture of Calno and Carchemish, Hamath and Arpad, Samaria and Damascus, clearly belongs to our reign. But the Greek read a different text, and it may perhaps be suspected that here, too, we have a later form based on early information. Of the same type and period are the historical references in the Assyrian speeches of Kings. Although attributed to Sennacherib, they really fit better the situation in the time of Sargon.

The account of the end of Samaria in its two parallel forms belongs at least in part to this reign. The basis of this seems to be a contemporary or nearly contemporary account and, brief as it is, seems thoroughly accurate. As I have already shown, we must accept its most important statement, that it was Shalmaneser and not Sargon who took Samaria. The embassy of Merodach Baladan has always been a troublesome chronological difficulty. The great objection to placing it in Sargon's reign is the fact that the current chronology would not permit Hezekiah to be placed so far back. But this chronology is purely artificial and can hardly count. On the other hand, the time Merodach Baladan had under Sennacherib was too

small and his position too precarious to seduce Hezekiah, whereas it would be most natural for that prince to unite with the Chaldaean who had just won the battle at Dur ilu against the Assyrian who had already, or rather his predecessor, put an end to the northern kingdom and was already threatening his own. Perhaps, too, the account of Hezekiah's Philistine wars may be connected with the Ashdod revolt in 711 rather than with the Ekron troubles of 701.

It is with these materials that we must reconstruct the history of Western Asia in the time of Sargon. As must always be the case in the history of the past, there are many deplorable gaps which we would gladly have filled. Yet, when we consider the lapse of time, we must admit that there is a remarkably large amount of material with which to attempt this reconstruction. For the space of time, barely sixteen years, and the extent of country, a good part of Western Asia, we may challenge comparison with many a period of classical or even mediaeval history. And there are few periods of history, ancient or mediaeval, which furnish so fine an opportunity for the exercise of the historian's art as does this corner of the "sometime realm of archaeology".

ACCESSION

SARGON THE YOUNGER, THE man who formed the central object of one of the most brilliant periods of ancient Oriental history, might well boast himself a self-made man, for in spite of his boasts of the three hundred and fifty kings who ruled Assyria before him, and of his mention of the kings his fathers, it is certain that he was not of the blood royal. What his real ancestry was we do not know. He himself keeps a discreet silence on the subject. His son, Sennacherib, secured a splendid ancestry, for he claimed descent from the old mythical heroes, Gilgamish, Eabani, Humbaba, and the like. This was evidently felt to be going too far, for Esarhaddon already as crown prince gives the more modest genealogy which became standard. According to this, Sargon was a scion of the old half mythical house of Bel ibni, son of Adasi.

As we do not know his family, so we do not know his real name. On his accession he assumed that of Sharrukin, better known to us, from its Biblical form, as Sargon. The reason for this is clear. Two thousand years before there had ruled in Agade a mighty monarch, Shargani by name, whose power and wealth were still evidenced by the inscriptions in the temples he had erected. Originally the name seems to have meant "A god has established him as king". A later age had forgotten this meaning, and it had, by a process of folk etymology, come to mean "The established king". It was in this latter sense that the usurper assumed it, and by the plays upon it in his own records showed to the world his well-established rule.

Shargani thus became a sort of patron saint to his name-sake. He did not, it is true, claim descent from him. But we do see a sort of a Sargon renaissance, a renewed interest in everything touching the older monarch. For instance, there had come down a great astronomical treatise, the "Illumination of Bel", which was ascribed to Shargani. This was introduced into Assyria and frequently copied in this and succeeding reigns. To the same influence must no doubt be ascribed the well-known archaism in art and in religion, the care for Babylonia, perhaps even the foundation of a new Dur Sharrukin in imitation of the earlier one which had borne Shargani's name.

Perhaps the most artistic and interesting result was the production of the Sargon legends, which, in all probability, had long floated about in popular story and were now retouched for the glory of the usurper king. Of this literature, two specimens have come down to us. One is

an omen tablet which reports the deeds done by Sargon or his son Naram Sin under such and such a sign of the heavens, how three years were spent in the land of the setting sun, how the sea of the setting sun was crossed and his image erected, how Kastubilla of Kagala was defeated and the land of Surri, and how a great city was built in his honor.

But if this is, after all, only a dry astrological text, the other is one of the gems of Assyrian literature. The story has often been told of how his father he did not know and his mother, a woman of low degree, bore him in secret, how, like the little Moses, the infant was placed in an ark of rushes and entrusted to the water, how the water carried him to the irrigator Akki who reared him and made him a gardener until the goddess Ishtar came to love him and gave him rule over the black-headed folk and granted him victories over Dilmun and Dur ilu.

Beautiful as all this is, it is so clearly legendary that we cannot wonder that the earlier scholars were inclined to make him an entirely mythical personage. Even though we now know that Shargani actually lived and was a great ruler, we have no more right to assume that these legends tell the truth than we have to describe the policy of Theodoric the Ostrogoth on the basis of the romantic adventures of Dietrich of Berne. Knowing how legends grow up, we should be inclined to suspect the account even if nearly contemporary. How much more so when it is separated from its subject by perhaps as long an interval as that which separates us from Sargon himself. The tablet of omens comes from the library of Ashurbanipal and bears his mark, while the legend tablet dates from the eighth century. But still closer is the internal evidence. Both Sargon the Younger and the hero of these legends are alike in having no royal ancestors. Both warred in Elam, and in Syria, and at Dur ilu, and conquered Tilmun. Both crossed the sea of the setting sun and both erected a stele in Cyprus. The legendary hero refers to "my successor" (*arku*), and sure enough *arku*, "the second", is so common a title of Sargon, that, in the form of Arkeanos, it has come down as his name in the Greek-Babylonian list of Ptolemy. All this points clearly to our time as the date of fabrication.

What was the character of the man who, on the death of Shalmaneser IV on the 22d. of Tebet (December 28), 722 BC, came to the throne? As compared with the characters in classical or in mediaeval Arabic history, it is difficult to understand the personalities

of the Assyrian rulers. Yet the attempt may be made, for, in spite of the tendency to conform every such ruler to a majestic, impersonal type of the Assyrian rule itself, we can see a strong personality here. And certainly strength of character must have been one of the most important facts in the man who could usurp the throne, hold it so well, extend its boundaries, and develop it internally, and then hand it on to such men as his successors. With strength we often associate coarseness and ferocity. Judged by the standards of our own day, Sargon was horribly cruel. Judged by those of his own, he was as far from the barbarity of Ashurnasirpal as he was from the comparative weakness of Esarhaddon. And for his cruelty he had his excuse. The Assyrian empire was still in a precarious condition; indeed, it never again was really safe, and firmness was absolutely needful. If it was necessary for state reasons to flay a man alive, Sargon probably had no compunctions. That he was not merely a blood-thirsty tyrant there is plenty of evidence to show. After conquest he organized territory. If the administrative system dates to Tiglath Pileser III or even earlier, he at least carried out those designs, and so deserves the credit for a fair amount of political sagacity.

Since he gained the throne by the aid of the religious party, we naturally expect to see something of a religious type in his nature. This may have been only affectation, but it more probably was genuine. The simple soldier who owed his throne to priestly aid was certainly grateful. How great an influence the priestly party gained in his reign may be surmised by the reaction against it in the reign of his son Sennacherib. To how great an extent Sargon was really cultivated we may only conjecture. There were great building enterprises, there was sculpture of a high type, there was much literature produced. But all this was merely to glorify the king, and we may doubt if the soldier cared much for art for art's sake.

Thus, as we attempt to find individual characteristics, we have a sense of failure. Even his sculptured portrait is of little value, for it gives us only the conventional king.

The many conjectures previously made as to the way Sargon came to the throne are now rendered useless by the discovery of a bit of clay. From this we learn that Shalmaneser had committed the unheard-of sacrilege of laying tribute on the old sacred city of Ashur, the cradle of Assyrian power. Harran, too, the capital of that great Mesopotamian kingdom which was united with Assyria in a sort of personal union, was in the same evil case. The god, Ashur, became

angry, overthrew Shalmaneser, and presented the crown to Sargon. Translated into plain English, Sargon took advantage of the insult thus offered to the pride and the pocket-book of the great cities, and, with the aid of the priesthood, secured the throne. They had their reward. During the whole reign the priestly party was high in power, and a wave of religious reaction swept over at least the palace circle, while Ashur and Harran were once more given their old privileges and governed directly by the crown.

Yet, in spite of his religious tendencies, Sargon was a great warrior, and indeed the greater part of his recorded history consists of a series of wars. No doubt there were pressing questions of home policy, perhaps even there were revolts, though we hear of none. But, as is always clear to a usurper, the best way of settling questions of legitimacy is by leading the nation to victory in foreign wars. Nor was it mere lust of conquest or needs of home policy which kept the armies of Sargon in the field year after year. During the half century of Assyrian weakness new powers had come into being, and now Assyria was surrounded by a ring of hostile states, any one of which was not an enemy to be despised, while a union such as afterwards brought about the fall of the empire was even now an imminent peril.

On the south border little was to be feared from the Babylonians, who had been rendered unwarlike by their long civilization. But here as elsewhere there had been a gradual inworking of Arab tribes of whom the Kaldu or Chaldaeans were the most important. Under Babylonian influence they had gained a certain veneer of civilization. Their leader was now a certain Merodach Baladan (Marduk aplu iddin), whose name shows his Babylonian leanings. Already, in 731, he had come into contact with Tiglath Pileser and had been forced to pay tribute. During the weaker reign of Shalmaneser he had extended his power from his home land in Bit Iakin, in the marshes of the Tigris and Euphrates, and had won the confidence of the Babylonians. When, therefore, Sargon usurped the Assyrian throne, Merodach Baladan was in a position to grasp his opportunity. Babylon surrendered, and soon after, on the New Year's Day (April 2), 721, he "seized the hands of Bel", was recognized as the *de jure* king of the South, and took the titles of "King of Babylon" and "King of Shumer and Akkad". The natives seem to have welcomed him as a deliverer from the Assyrian yoke, at any rate there certainly was a strong pro-Chaldaeian party in the city.

Merodach Baladan was supported, not only by the various

Aramaean tribes but also by Humbanigash of Elam. Alliance with Elam had long been a fundamental article in the policy of Babylonia. In earlier times that country had had a long and important career, often at the expense of Babylon. Of late it had been much weakened, the history becomes obscure, and even the succession of kings is lost. A new era began with the accession of Humbanigash in 742 BC. The earlier years of his reign seem to have been spent in reducing to order the feudal princes who so regularly weakened the country. There was peace with Assyria, for a long line of Aramaic buffer states protected Elam from her more powerful neighbor. But Tiglath Pileser conquered and incorporated these states, while he also obtained personal rule in Babylon. This brought Elam into great danger. The Chaldaean conquest of Babylon must greatly weaken Assyria and protect a considerable stretch of Elamitish border from Assyrian attack. We can therefore see why Humbanigash preferred to fight his battles for Elam on the plains of Babylonia.

The situation in regard to Elam was further complicated by the Median tribes which were gradually working their way in from the east, and, like the Aramaeans, were warring against Elam and Assyria alike. As yet, the danger was not serious. A force was constantly engaged on the borders and now and then we hear of the conquest of some petty tribe. Already Iranian and Aramaean were meeting at the Zab, as Hun and Saracen later met in Central Europe.

Reaching in a great arc from northeast to northwest were the provinces and dependencies of the empire which, in the half century of Assyrian decline, had become the most powerful in Western Asia. Coming down from the region of the Caucasus, the Haldians had gradually forced their way south until, in the reign of Ashurnasirpal, they had come into touch with the Assyrians. For a time they were held in check, but as Assyria began to decline, Haldia won and held the supremacy of the civilized world under the vigorous rule of Menuash and Argishtish I. When the Assyrian power once more revived under Tiglath Pileser III, Sardurish II, the successor of Argishtish, held all of Armenia, Western Mesopotamia, Western Asia Minor, and North Syria more or less completely under his control. To be sure, all this extent of territory was rather imposing than effective, for time enough had not been allowed for a real amalgamation, yet the pro-Haldian party was strong and a severe struggle was needed to drive Sardurish out of Syria. Tiglath Pileser followed this up with an invasion of Haldia itself but, although the capital, Tushpa, was taken

and burned, Sardurish held out on the high isolated rock which forms the citadel of Van, and the Assyrians were forced to retreat as winter came on.

When a new ruler, Rusash, son of Sardurish, or Ursa, as Sargon calls him, ascended the throne, some time about 725, the imperial position of Haldia had been largely lost. The new monarch, as events quickly showed, was well adapted to restore the lost prestige of his people. His first care seems to have been the restoration of the ruined city. The older town, Menuahina, founded by Menuash, the greatest of the Haldian builders, had been completely destroyed. Rusash rebuilt it, not on the old site, but further north where we now have Toprak Kaleh, and called is Rusahina. Since the water of Lake Van is not potable, he constructed, far to the east among the barren and desert wastes, where his inscription has been found, an immense reservoir, now known as Keshish Goll, or Priests' Sea. At Van and at Aluchalu, on Lake Gokcha, temples were also erected to Teishbash, the storm and air god.

The accession of a new and more vigorous ruler naturally meant a more vigorous foreign policy. Scanty as our sources are, we are still not left in entire ignorance of conditions along the frontier. At Aluchalu, on Lake Gokcha, and therefore well within present Russian territory, we have an inscription. Its very position shows a considerable advance to be probable. It also mentions twenty-four countries which had been conquered, although the vagueness of our present geography gives us little clue to their location, whose inhabitants were carried off to Haldia. On the east, a similar advance seems to be demanded by the sovereignty of Muçaçir. On the west, however, where the earlier kings had ruled as far as Melitene, the boundary had been drawn back, for at this time that place was ruled by an independent prince. From the circumstances presupposed by Sargon's frontier fortifications, we must assume that the Euphrates was here the boundary. On the south was the greatest danger. Here the line ran a perilously short distance south of the capital, which was thus exposed to raiding. But in this matter of raiding the Haldians had the advantage, for it was easy for a band of the mountaineers to rush down upon some undefended spot in Assyria, while the heavier armies of the latter would be under considerable difficulties, if a return expedition was undertaken. Regular military expeditions in this region were few and brief. The Haldians had only to retire to their fortresses and allow the enemy to ravage as he pleased, then, when the early

winter forced him to retreat, they issued forth, blocked the passes, harrassed the rear, and often inflicted great damage.

The influence of Rusash must not be confined to the region he ruled. With Merodach Baladan, with whom he may have been allied, he was the cause of almost every war of the reign. Could these two be put out of the way, the remaining conquests would not be difficult.

Back of the Haldians and no doubt already exerting pressure on them, were other Iranian tribes. As yet, they seem to have been unknown to the Assyrians. By the end of the reign they would be known only too well. Had the Assyrians realized that in attacking and destroying the neighboring states they were but putting out of the way buffer states whose loss would expose themselves to attack, they might have hesitated. More probably it would not have changed conditions.

On the northwest frontier there was little danger, but much inducement. Only one object blocked the way. Carchemish, a fragment of the old "Hittite" power, held the way to Syria and to Asia Minor and dominated the trade route to the west. Mercantile as well as political reasons were therefore demanding the removal of this eyesore to the Assyrian merchants. Once Carchemish passed, there remained only petty Hittite states to conquer. The way was open to a reconquest of those Asia Minor possessions held in the earlier days of Assyrian greatness, to Pteria, the great Hittite city, perhaps to the Black Sea itself. Of the power which, under Midas of Phrygia, was rapidly conquering Asia Minor, the Assyrians seem as yet to have known nothing.

Syria had been virtually brought under the control of Assyria by Tiglath Pileser and a large addition to the immediate territory of Assyria had been made when Shalmaneser captured Samaria and brought the Israelitish kingdom to its end. But the revolution at home had for the moment weakened Assyrian influence in this region. Affairs in Israel were still in a very unsettled condition. In Hamath and in Gaza rulers of ability seemed about to unite Syria against the Assyrians. In Judaea the young Hezekiah had but recently come to the throne. His religious reformation looked very much like a protest against the pro-Assyrian religious policy of his father Ahaz, and an embassy from Merodach Baladan had just come to him urging revolt. Egypt was recovering herself under Ethiopic hegemony and had already interfered in the Samaria affair. In Arabia things were in a ferment as a result of the impending change from Minaean to Sabaean

overlordship, while all along its borders new swarms were pouring out and pressing upon the civilized nations.

Such were the circumstances of the Assyrian neighbors, and such were the problems presented to Sargon. On all sides Assyria was hard pressed by nations less civilized than herself. It was impossible for Assyria to hold her present frontiers, for only in a few cases were these "scientific". Only by constant advances could enemies be put out of the way, while each new advance meant a longer frontier to guard, a larger mass of unassimilated peoples within it, and a further depletion of the governing class. The task was too great for so small a people and ultimate failure was certain. Yet it was a great thing for civilization that the barbarian peoples were held back until they had more or less come under the influence of the Assyro-Babylonian culture, and that the empire endured so long as it did was due in no small measure to the hard fighting qualities of Sargon.

BABYLONIA AND SYRIA

SARGON ASCENDED THE THRONE at the very end of 722. What he did during the first year we do not know. In all probability he was engaged in settling himself firmly on the throne and in arranging the changes he found necessary from his point of view.

It was impossible for an Assyrian monarch to live in peace. Even if he wished to do so, circumstances were against him. So far as we know, the first collision with a foreign power took place in Babylonia some time in 720. Merodach Baladan, as soon as he was safe in Babylon, had sent to Humbanigash for aid, and now the Elamite was attempting to descend the Aft-ab valley to join his ally. But Sargon still held Dur ilu, a strong fortress which commanded that pass. When the Elamites reached the plain they found an Assyrian army drawn up to meet them. A battle took place and the Assyrians were driven from the field, although they still held Dur ilu. The Assyrians retreated to the north, though not so rapidly but that they could take vengeance on the petty Aramaean tribes of the Mattisai and Tumuna, whose pro-Assyrian sheikh had been bound and sent to Babylon. But now Merodach Baladan came up with his army and united with Humbanigash, after which they ravaged the nearby parts of Assyria.

A tactical victory had thus been won by the allies. The Aft-ab valley was opened and free communications with Elam secured. For twelve years no Assyrian army invaded Babylonia, and Merodach Baladan was left to his own devices. But one great mistake was made. Dur ilu was left, perhaps because, after all, the armies were too small, in the hands of the Assyrians. So long as they held it, communications between the allies were always subject to interruption, while it formed a good base for intrigues with the anti-Chaldaeian party in Babylon or for actual military operations. So long as an advanced post such as this was at the very doors of Babylon, the southern question could not be considered settled.

In this same year, 720, Sargon was able to devote attention to the threatening state of affairs in Syria, which seems to have been completely neglected since the capture of Samaria by Shalmaneser in 723. Now all Syria was again in revolt, the two centers being at Hamath under Iaubidi and at Gaza under Hanunu.

In earlier times Hamath had been of great importance as the most southerly of the great Hittite cities. In the reign of Tiglath Pileser, it

was definitely brought under Assyrian control, though not yet made a province. The constant presence of Assyrian troops in Syria during the last days of Shalmaneser must have kept it quiet, and so it was probably in the usurpation of Sargon that Iaubidi saw the opportunity for a like usurpation of his own. According to the testimony of his name, he was of the newer Aramaean stock which was now supplanting the older Hittite; though that this gives a proof that the Hebrew Yahweh was worshiped in Hamath is not certain. While Iaubidi was the nominal leader of the revolt, we must see the real instigator no doubt in Rusash, the Haldian, whose influence in North Syria must still have been strong. Of the other cities engaged, Arpad had but recently been the great center of Haldian influence in Syria and had been taken only after a three years' siege. Damascus had lost its independence only fifteen years before, while Samaria had met the same fate but three years before. Cimirra represented the Phoenician coast, and Tyre too seems to have taken part in this revolt. There are also indications that Bar Rekab of Samal, a state near to Arpad, forgot his allegiance to Assyria, perhaps his boasted love to Tiglath Pileser did not extend to the supplanter of his dynasty, and joined the coalition.

The allies do not seem to have acted in concert, it would have been too much to expect of a Syrian confederation, or perhaps Sargon was too quick for them. Iaubidi took up his position at Qarqar, to the north of Hamath, to meet the advancing Assyrians. Once before, 854, the Syrians had met Assyrians on this field and had defeated them and saved Syria for the time. Now they were in turn defeated, and Iaubidi fell into the hands of the victors. This was the first success of the reign, and it needed to be emphasized. A horrible punishment, only too common, was decreed for the unfortunate Iaubidi. He was carried to Assyria and flayed alive. Later, a vivid bas-relief was set up on the walls of the new capital, a warning against revolt to the petty princes who brought their tribute to Dur Sharrukin.

After the battle, Qarqar was taken and burned and Hamath, which seems to have lain not far off, was also captured, its low-lying position giving little opportunity for defense. Of its inhabitants many were killed, others were made captive, while the flower of the troops, two hundred charioteers and six hundred horsemen, was added to the standing army which Sargon was now forming to take the place of the old feudal levy. The position of Hamath on the great road from the north to Egypt was important, as its relation to the modern railway

shows. To secure it, a colony of six thousand three hundred native Assyrians was settled here, and an Assyrian governor was placed over them. The site of this city is now represented, no doubt, by the big bare mound which stands in the center of the modern town, and here, if we should excavate, we should probably find not only the relics of an earlier Hittite people, but even cuneiform documents of the sort already found in the mounds of Palestine.

The capture of Hamath seems to have ended the revolt in the north, and the other cities submitted. Then he moved south to attack Hanunu of Gaza, around whom the revolt in the south centered. Gaza held one of the most important positions in the ancient world. As the last Syrian city towards Egypt on the great Syro-Egyptian trade route, and as the seaport of the Arabian caravan road, its possession was no less valuable from the commercial than from the military standpoint. This was thoroughly understood in Egypt where the holding of advance lines on Syrian soil has always been a fundamental part of the national policy. As soon as the Ethiopian rulers began to secure Lower Egypt, it was felt that an advance on Syria was to be part of the general program. Already, in the time of Tiglath Pileser, the first attempt had been made and Hanunu had been won over. The attempt failed, and Hanunu was forced to flee to Egypt. During the weaker reign of Shalmaneser he returned, deposed the Assyrian protege Idibi'il, and regained his throne. In this he was helped by a certain Sibu who was enabled by his success in Gaza to produce the rebellion of Hoshea of Israel.

Shalmaneser secured the fall of Samaria, but was put out of the way before he could attack Gaza, and Sargon now took up his work. What happened when he reached Gaza is not clear, but he seems to have fought a battle before its gates. The city was captured and the allies fell back toward Egypt, perhaps toward Rhinocolura, on the "Brook" of Egypt, where a frontier post seems always to have been held. Sibu summoned his tartan, or lieutenant, to come to his aid, and the two armies met at Rapihu (Raphia), where now the boundary between Egypt and Syria is marked and where later Lagidae and Seleucidae (Ptolemy IV versus Antiochus III) contested the control of Southern Syria. Sibu fled "as a shepherd deprived of his flock", so Sargon boasts, and Syria knew his intrigues no more. Hanunu was less fortunate, but was captured and taken to the city of Ashur with nearly ten thousand of his men. Rapihu, probably at that time only a fortified camp, was destroyed, but Gaza, perhaps as a reward for treachery,

was spared. Under the direct control of the crown, it lasted on and flourished through Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian times until Alexander, by his destruction of Tyre, showed his hostility to Syrian commerce. Then first Gaza resisted the powers that be and met its fate.

It is interesting to note that Sargon did not attempt to follow up his advantages and attack Egypt or even Rhinocolura. Perhaps his forces had already suffered severely, or perhaps he felt that the conquest of Egypt was impossible, until he had secured a firmer hold in Syria. For the next few years much attention was devoted to settlement of Syrian affairs. Those cities which were not directly implicated in the revolts were allowed to retain their autonomy under the local kings. Those which were, Samal Cimirra, Damascus, the mainland Tyre, and Samaria, soon appear with Assyrian governors, and it is probable that this took place at the present time. Hamath, as already noted, was made an Assyrian colony.

In the case of one city, Samaria, the native records tell us a little more of this process of settlement. The city itself had already been taken by Shalmaneser, but all further arrangements seem to have been left to Sargon. Twenty-seven thousand of the leading citizens of the kingdom were deported and settled in Mesopotamia and Media, there to form a nucleus for that community of Jews, who for a long time made the east the real center of Jewish thought. But Samaria was not abandoned. The city was rebuilt and the survivors made Assyrian citizens with the usual tribute to be paid to the Assyrian governor.

The system of deportation was in common use at this time, the purpose being to break up the local attachments and to make the new settlers, naturally on bad terms with the original inhabitants of the land, feel that they owed everything to the protection of the imperial power. Five cases are known at least. In 720 the Aramaean tribes from near Dur ilu, the Tumunu and the Mattisai, were settled in Syria, probably at Hamath. In 717 the revolted Papa and Lallukua, two tribes of Hittite origin, were settled in Damascus. In 715 Sargon claims to have settled tribes in Samaria from Arabia. More probably this was merely an acknowledgment of the accomplished fact. As the Syrian localities gradually became deserted owing to the constant civil wars and the attacks of Assyria, the resistance to the constant pressure from the desert weakened and the Arabs pushed in even as they have to this day, when we still have Bedawin considerable distances west of the Jordan. If they only paid tribute, the Assyrians could have no

objections to their settlement, and so to this cause perhaps as much as any other we owe the Aramaization of this region. Daiukku (Deioces) of Media and Itti of Allabria were settled at Hamath.

These four desert tribes of the "distant Arabs" were the Tamudi, the Ibadidi, the Marsimani, and the Haiapa. Their former location, if we can judge from the identification of the Haiapa with the Midianite clan Ephah, was on the Gulf of Aqabah and along the eastern shore of the Red Sea. It is also in this region, at the ruins of Medain Calih, that we have localized the story of the Thamud, clearly the Tamudi of our inscriptions. This Thamud, according to the prophet Mohammed, was a great prehistoric tribe, the successor of Ad. In the pride of their hearts they "made from the plains castles and dug out the mountains into houses". At last there came unto them the prophet Calih who preached to them the doctrine of the Unity. Nevertheless, they would not accept the manifest sign of the she camel, sprung from the rock in witness against them, but hardened their hearts and hamstrung her. Then came the great earthquake, and in the morning they all lay on their faces, dead in their houses. Such was the tale told by the prophet to point the moral to those who would not accept his own teaching. In reality, Thamud was a petty tribe in Assyrian times, and as a petty tribe it was still known to the Roman geographers.

To the same year we have assigned the "tribute", the senders no doubt considered it only a present from ruler to ruler, of Piru of Mucri (Pharaoh of Egypt), Samsi queen of the land of Aribbi, and of Itamra of Saba. Does this "tribute" of Pharaoh mean a settlement by treaty of the Syrian question by the two powers interested? The fact that there has been found at Kalhu, where Sargon at this time resided, a bit of clay, evidently affixed to a parchment or papyrus document, bearing the seals of Shabaka and of an unknown Assyrian ruler, seems to point in this direction.

Samsi, queen of Aribbi, is interesting to us as representing the older matriarchal form of authority current in Arabia, the classic example of which is found in the Queen of Sheba who visited Solomon. Samsi, who probably lived in the desert region immediately south of the Euphrates rather than in Arabia proper, had already sent "tribute" to Tiglath Pileser.

The mention of Itamra the Sabaean is of great importance for our knowledge of Arabian history. Itamra must be one of the mukarrib (princes) or kings who appear as Yatha- amar in the Sabaean inscriptions, and thus a clue is secured for the chronology of pre-

Muslim Arabia. It also gives us a new conception of conditions in that region. If this was not a tribute, but rather a present from equal to equal, why was it sent? No doubt, it was felt that the two civilized powers ought to unite against the more barbarous tribes between. Again, as the two countries had no mutual boundaries to cause friction, so they had no commercial rivalries, but rather they had goods each wished to exchange with the other. Thus far, this trade had been in the hands of Syrians, but the merchants of Assyria would be glad to import their goods themselves and by a less round-about route. The most important reason, no doubt, was the wish of the Sabaeans to displace the older power of Ma'in. To do this a stroke directed at their commerce would accomplish most. Assyria now held Gaza, the Mediterranean port of the Minaeans. Assyria seems to have taken the side of Saba and thus accelerated the decay of Ma'in.

For about six years after the settlement of 720 Syria remained fairly quiet. But, whatever the truth about a treaty with Egypt, that country continued to intrigue with the Philistine coast. About 714 Azuri, king of Ashdod, withheld tribute and instigated a revolt of his neighbors. This was quickly quelled and his brother, Ahimiti, the crown prince, elevated to the throne. His reign was short, for the anti-Assyrian party was still in control, and as soon as the Assyrian army retired to go into winter quarters he was overthrown and a mercenary Greek soldier from Cyprus, called Iamani or "the Ionian", was chosen in his place. The revolt spread rapidly, Gath, Judah, Moab, and Edom taking part.

How important this outbreak was is shown by the haste with which Sargon acted. Although it was still early in the year 713, too early for the feudal levy to be called out, he did not hesitate, but sent his tartan, Ashur igka danin, with only the few hundred in his own body guard. The Tigris and Euphrates were crossed at full flood, and he suddenly appeared in Syria. Iamani had made his preparations, had surrounded the low-lying city with a trench, secured a water supply from outside the city, and called to his aid troops from other parts of the country. In spite of all this, he lost his heart when the Assyrians appeared so suddenly and fled to Egypt whence he was extradited and handed over to Sargon.

The cities of the Philistine plain were thus left defenseless and at least Ashdod with its port and Gath were taken. Their inhabitants, men and gods alike, were carried off into captivity. But these towns were too important to remain desolate long. They were therefore rebuilt and settled with loyal colonists. Over them was probably

placed that Mitinti we meet as king early in the reign of Sennacherib. The other revolted states probably remained unconquered. If Sargon now held the cities of the Philistine plain and controlled the great trade routes, he could afford to permit a precarious liberty to the mountaineers of Judah, Moab, and Ammon.

This sudden punishment seems to have strongly impressed the imagination of the Syrians and to have had a good effect in keeping Syria quiet. There are no further accounts of revolts. For the twelve years which extend to the invasion of Sennacherib in 701, there is absolutely not a single fact known in regard to the history of Syria.

THE NORTHWEST FRONTIER

THE SECOND OF THE frontiers was that on the northwest which we have already touched upon in mentioning Samal. Here the greatest advance in the reign took place, although the region had already been conquered by Shalmaneser I and Tiglath Pileser I. The half-century-long weakness of Assyria had given Haldia control of this region. Tiglath Pileser III broke the power of Sardurish and forced the states to pay tribute. For some reason he did not attempt to inflict his provincial system on them. Consequently, on his death, Haldia once more gained the ascendancy. Conditions were, however, changed, and Haldia found a new power which was, if a rival, also an ally against Assyria. This new power was that of Mita of Muski, or, to give him the name he more commonly is known by, Midas the Phrygian.

Some centuries earlier a number of Thracian tribes had invaded Asia Minor. The most important of these were the Phrygians, who seem to have already worked their way well to the east by the time of Tiglath Pileser. An opportunity for decided advance was here presented. Sardurish was weakened by defeats and Shalmaneser was weak in character. By the time when Sargon came to the throne, all Asia Minor was Phrygian, or under Phrygian influence. His actual frontier left the Mediterranean at Cilicia Trachaea and ran past Lake Tatta to the Halys river, the earlier Haldian boundary. Pteria itself, the old Hittite capital in this region, was probably in his hands, and perhaps from this fact he gained the title of the Muskian. He thus had, it would seem, as large an immediate kingdom as the later Lydians, while his influence beyond his borders to the east was greater. It is rather startling to find Carchemish on the Euphrates revolting at Phrygian instigation.

The first operations in this region took place in 718. In this year, Kiakki of Shinuhtu, a petty chieftain of Tabal, a somewhat ill-defined term applied to southern Cappadocia, refused to send tribute any longer, instigated, it may be presumed, by Midas. An army was sent against him, probably that commanded by the governor of eastern Cilicia or Que. Tarsus appears to have been the base. From this the army followed the time-honored war route which led through the Cilician Gates. In the rough Taurus country to the north the war dragged on until finally Kiakki and his fighting men were captured and deported.

Shinuhtu was not made a separate province, perhaps because it was

too small and too poor to be worth the trouble. A certain Matti of Tuna (Tyana) offered to pay a higher tribute of horses and mules, of gold and silver, and so the country was handed over to him in the hope, vain as it proved, that a buffer state could here be made against Phrygia. In this way, too, an excuse could be found for an attempted control of Tyana itself. That city, even then probably an important religious and political center, commanded the great cross road which ran from Tarsus through the Cilician Gates past Pteria and on to Sinope on the Black Sea. When Matti no longer was faithful. Tuna came under the direct control of the Assyrians.

The next year, 717, we find an expedition against Carchemish undertaken. Why it had been so long spared by the Assyrians we can only surmise. Probably it was, like the Phoenician cities, predominantly mercantile, perfectly willing to pay tribute so long as it could trade, and careless as to the political changes going on about it. During the period of Assyrian decline, it seems to have been left in peace to its own devices and naturally resented the loss of freedom and especially the tribute inflicted by Tiglath Pileser, since it probably was forced to make up arrears. Pisisir, who had held the throne since at least 740, was at last induced by Midas to throw off completely the Assyrian yoke.

The loss of Carchemish was serious. It commanded the great high road to Asia Minor and to Egypt, and its possession by a foreign power blocked the way to the west for both caravans and armies. Furthermore, as an advanced post for Midas it was dangerously near the old capital of Mesopotamia, Harran. Add to this the fact that Carchemish was the great commercial rival of Kalhu, and it may be seen that the commercial classes of Assyria would be bitterly opposed to passing over this revolt.

In spite of the evident importance of the site, neither Rusash nor Midas gave adequate support. A good fight was made, but the city was at length captured, Pisisir dethroned, and the country made a regularly organized Assyrian province. From this time on, so long as the empire itself lasted, Assyria held the great western road.

As might be expected, the sack of so great a city, perhaps the most important trading city of its time in the world, produced enormous booty. According to the official accounts, perhaps not to be entirely trusted, the value of the precious metals alone amounted to the huge sum of eleven talents of gold and twenty-one hundred of silver. Among other valuables carried off and laid up in Kalhu against the

day when they should adorn Dur Sharrukin were bronze, ivory, and elephant hides. Carchemish, like other mercantile cities, had her army, perhaps all mercenaries. These were taken over in a body and added to the new standing army.

While the danger to Assyria from a free Carchemish was thus great and its capture correspondingly important, the effect of its loss on the Hittite peoples has been much exaggerated. No doubt, it was their greatest commercial city and the transfer of commercial supremacy from an allied to a purely alien race made a difference. But we must remember that the "Hittite Empire", whatever it really was, had long been a thing of the past and that there was no organic union between the petty Hittite states which had taken its place. The allies had been, not these little states, but the greater rulers. Some were brought under Assyrian control, others never were, but all retained enough individuality to influence considerably the later peoples.

If Carchemish was actually destroyed after the siege, it did not long remain in ruins, for it had too important a situation. Sargon himself rebuilt portions, as we now know, while under his successors it became, as the relative rank of its governors shows, one of the greatest cities in the empire. Even though many of its inhabitants had been deported, it still retained a large Hittite element, and this mixing with Mesopotamian and Aramaean elements, produced a new race of which we should gladly know more. In many ways this new race must have improved upon the old. In art, for example, if we can judge from the exquisite stele of the mother goddess. We have here the same phenomenon which we see later in Asiatic or Egyptian art of the Greco-Roman period, the old religious conceptions preserved and reproduced, but with a temperance and a skill of technique which show superior artistic ability. As a center of commerce its influence was greatest. It is a significant proof of this, that, throughout the entire period of the later Assyrian empire, the most important commercial documents were reckoned according to the "mina of Carchemish."

The fall of Carchemish put out of the way a dangerous enemy in the rear of the governor of Cilicia. It was, therefore, possible for another advance to be made here. The Tyana road was, for the time at least, passed over. Instead, an attempt was to be made (716), directly on Iconium where Midas himself seems to have had his capital. Midas called Rusash to his aid. A battle was fought near the sea-coast, near the mouth of the Calycadnus, and Sargon claims the victory. As a

result, several towns long held by Midas were conquered and added to the province. But the main object, the gaining of the road to Iconium, was not secured. The inhabitants of Cilicia Trachaea have always been wild and difficult to conquer, and so the war dragged on until at least 709.

In 714 Sargon definitely took up the question of advance in this region. Once more, as in 718, the road through the Cilician Gates was taken. Matti of Tyana had recognized the real meaning of the Assyrian policy and had gone over to Midas. He was now attacked and deposed.

Sargon moved on to the north and attacked the Tabal clan of Bit Buritash. Here a certain Hulli had ruled in the days of Tiglath Pileser. On his death Sargon recognized his son, Ambaris, as his successor and, to bind him more closely to his cause, gave him his daughter, Ahatabisha. He also granted to him Hilakku (Cilicia), which at this time was north of the Taurus, about where the later strategica of Cilicia was situated, although it is quite possible that he simply gave him the privilege of conquering it, if he could.

The royal lady seems to have been unable to keep her husband true. He, too, went over to Midas and Rusash. But, as usual, they proved broken reeds to lean upon, for Ambaris was captured and carried off with all his father's house. One hundred chariots were impressed into the royal army, the leading citizens were deported, and prisoners from other quarters settled in their place. Then, after Tabal had been thoroughly ravaged, a governor was placed over it, and the country was made an Assyrian province.

This campaign had opened up the Tarsus-Tyana-Mazaka road to the Halys River, which would thus form the northern boundary of the province to be established. Along the west, Lake Tatta would serve as a boundary, but to the south of that the ground would be debatable. To the east, the Euphrates would naturally be taken, for Haldia had now withdrawn behind that river. Thus the new province could be given, on nearly every side, a boundary which might be truly called "scientific". It was to the securing of this frontier that the operations of the next year were directed.

The greater part of this coveted territory was known as Kammanu. Its name was derived, no doubt, from the old sacred city of Comana, which was situated in the bare desert cleft in the western part of this region. At present, the capital was Meliddu, which has always been, both as the classical Melitene and the Malatia of modern times, the

center of a great road-complex and therefore a position of importance. Some time before this, a certain Gunzinanu had been deposed, and Tarhunazi had taken his place. Sargon had recognized, if not encouraged, the change, and had added some lands. When Ambaris revolted, Tarhunazi seems to have followed his example, at least so far as to withhold his tribute. The advance on Meliddu seems to have been made from Amida as a base. Kammanu was devastated and the capital taken. Tarhunazi fled westward to his strong fortress of Tulgarimmu, the Biblical Togormah, where he was besieged and forced to surrender. He was cast into chains, and, with wife, children, and five thousand troops, carried off to Ashur, where the party was settled.

The required lines had now been secured, at least after a fashion, and the subjugation of the less important interior might be left to time. The frontier itself needed fortification. First Tulgarimmu was rebuilt with Meliddu. Then three forts were erected on the west against Midas, two on the north as protection against the barbarians, and five along the Euphrates on the Haldian frontier. The space thus enclosed, a wedge thrust forward between Haldia and Phrygia, was made a province under the usual forms of administration and settled by captives from various parts of the empire, the last instalment of Sute not arriving until after the capture of Babylon (710).

The next year an opportunity came for securing the most important site in the interior still unconquered. At Marqasi, the modern Marash, the Hittite ruler, Tarhulara, had been murdered by his anti-Assyrian son, Mutallu. Sargon, however, took him prisoner, armies could easily be concentrated on him from several sides, and carried him off with all the tribe of Bit Pa'alla and much booty. Gurgume,* from which Tarhulara had come, was rebuilt, and an Assyrian governor installed in Marqasi.

In the next years, probably 711-709, the final pacification of Que proper was accomplished by its governor. In three expeditions the infantry penetrated the Taurus, took two fortresses situated on hilltops and made twenty-four hundred prisoners. Of these, nearly a thousand were carried the whole length of the empire from Que to the king, as he lay encamped at Irma'mi in Elam. To take their place other Assyrian subjects were settled. But it now began to be seen that a crossing of Cilicia Trachaea was impracticable, and the advance was stopped.

At about the same time or perhaps a little later, trouble broke out

on the extreme north, where Mutallu of Qummuh, a land situated somewhat to the north of the later Commagene, had abandoned friendly relations with Sargon and gone over to Argishtish, who had recently succeeded Rusash in Haldia. The governor of the new province invaded his country, took some of his fortresses and much booty, and even some of his family. But Mutallu himself simply retired to the wild mountains nearby. The lowland regions were settled by captives from Bit Iakin, to which place the Qummuh men were in their turn deported. This seems to be the high-water mark of Assyrian influence in this region. Before the end of the reign the Iranians began to come in and the frontier receded.

In connection with affairs on this frontier, we may note the Assyrian relations with Cyprus. Here the Greeks had gradually been settling until by now they seem to have gained control of the greater part of the island. They naturally, as enemies of the Phoenicians in the island, were inclined to be friendly with the Assyrians who had already secured control of the Phoenicians on the mainland. No doubt, too, Midas had tried to conquer the Greeks along the coast, as the Lydians tried later, and enmity to him would again make them favorable to Sargon. On the other hand, the Assyrians had no fleet, and so there was little danger of conquest from them. Furthermore, friendship with the great empire would mean commercial privileges throughout the whole of its provinces, and the Greeks would not forget this. We can therefore well understand why, when Sargon was still in Babylon, probably after his return from the extreme south (709), he received an embassy and presents, gold and silver, (it is curious that we have no mention of the copper which received its name from the island), *ushu* and *ukarinu* woods, from the land of Ia, a region of Iatnana, as the Assyrians named Cyprus. In return, Sargon sent to Cyprus the splendid "image of his majesty", which is now in Berlin. The Greeks of Cyprus continued to keep in friendly relation with succeeding kings, and once in a while sent presents. To the end, however, they retained their independence and Assyria never really ruled the island.

THE ARMENIAN WARS

AS WE HAVE ALREADY seen, one of the antagonists most to be feared by Assyria was Rusash of Haldia. His attempts to regain the lost Haldian conquests west of the Euphrates have been noted in the last chapter. In this, we shall see the efforts of Sargon to bring the war directly home to him.

When Sargon turned his attention to affairs on this part of his frontier, in 719, he found a good base for attack in the large and important tribe of the Mannai who lived to the southeast of Haldia. As next-door neighbors to that power, they naturally threw in their lot with Assyria. At this time their chief was Iranzu, who seems to have been devoted to his Assyrian ally. To the south of the Mannai lay Zikirtu, whose chief, Mittatti, just as naturally allied himself with Rusash against the Mannai. While Sargon, or at least his armies, were engaged elsewhere, Mittatti persuaded two of the Mannai towns, Shuandahuh and Durdukka, to revolt against Iranzu, and sent a garrison to hold them. Iranzu appealed to Sargon, and Sargon sent an army. So well garrisoned were they that a regular siege with siege engines was needed to capture them. When taken, they were burned and their inhabitants deported. At about the same time, the three neighboring towns of Sukkia, Bala, and Abitekna were captured and the people carried off to Syria.

Again, in 717, there were disturbances in this region, as the Papa and Lallukna were ravaging the friendly land of Kakme. They were conquered and deported to Damascus.

About this time the Mannai themselves went over to Haldia. Iranzu, the friend of Assyria, died, or to use the more picturesque Assyrian expression, "his fate came upon him". His son and successor, Aza, was also a "lover of the yoke of Ashur." The "yoke of Ashur," however, was anything but light, and Rusash, who had already made trouble for Assyria, persuaded the commons to strike for liberty. Perhaps we may see in it a revolt of the Aryans against the older race for the new ruler. Bagdatti of Uishdish bears an Iranian name, and was supported by Mitatti of Zikirtu. Aza was deposed and his dead body exposed on Mount Uaush. His reign, too, was short, for the Assyrians took him alive, flayed him, and exposed his bleeding form on this same Mount Uaush.

He was succeeded by Ullusunu, the brother of Aza, who had thus a

legitimate claim to the throne. Whether placed on the throne by the Assyrians or not, he soon saw that Rusash was the nearer and more dangerous foe. He therefore made his peace with Haldia and handed over, probably not without compulsion, twenty-two towns as proof of his good faith. As a result of his defection from Assyria, Ashur liu of Karalla, and Itti of AUabria followed his example.

All these events seem to have taken place in 717, if not earlier. Now, in 716, a new expedition was sent out, seemingly under the Nabuhashadua, whose report on the affairs of Ashur liu and Ullusunu has come down to us. The expedition succeeded. Ullusunu took to the hills on their approach, but when he saw the burning and plundering of his capital, Izirtu, as well as some of his other cities, he came out and sued for peace. This was granted with alacrity, showing either that his defection was considered due to force or that the friendship of the Mannai was too important for Sargon to risk it by severe measures.

The two chieftains who had followed his example did not come off so easily, for an example was needed, and they were not important enough to make severe treatment dangerous. Ashur liu was flayed alive and his men deported to Hamath, where they were joined by Itti and his family. Karalla was made a province, while Allabria was granted to a certain Adar aplu iddin, whose name indicates his Assyrian leanings.

The next year, 715, the results were more or less unimportant. One expedition was directed against a certain Daiukku, a Mannai governor, who had given his son to Rusash as a hostage. Rusash, however, gave no help, and Daiukku was deported to Hamath. The name of the man is more interesting than his personality. Daiukku is nothing but Deiokes, and it is quite possible that the proto-type of the Median prince who founded, according to Herodotus, the Median kingdom at this very time, is to be seen in this underling. We should also note that the name is Iranian. Do we see here, as in the case of Bagdatti, another reaction of the Iranian element in the Mannai against the non-Iranian?

Sargon next turned his attention to the twenty-two towns recently "given" to Rusash and won them back. The fact that they were restored to Ullusunu is another proof that his defection was unwilling. Even when Sargon erected a stele in Izirtu, his capital, he remained true to Assyria.

Another interesting event was the receiving of tribute from the

ianzu of Nairi at his capital of Hubushkia. Nairi, which here occurs for the last time, a comparatively restricted district, was once applied to all the tribes of the northern frontier. Tribute was also received from eight towns of the land of Tuaiadi, which was ruled by Telusina the Andian, and over four thousand men were deported from it.

The following year matters became more serious. To follow the Assyrian account we should assume that a direct attack was made on Rusash, that a great defeat was inflicted and that this defeat was so crushing that "when Ursa of Urartu heard of the destruction of Muçaçir, the capture of his god, Haldia, with his own hand, with the iron dagger of his girdle, his life he ended". In several ways, nevertheless, the story does not ring true, and even without documents from the Haldian side, its truth might be doubted. With the account of Rusash himself we can understand the general course of events.

The Mannai lay between Haldia and Muçaçir. Naturally, the two were united against them. As the more powerful, Rusash controlled Muçaçir. As a perpetual reminder of this control, Rusash followed Assyrian precedents and erected a statue of his national god Haldia in Muçaçir, while the native, and probably Iranian, Bagabartu, was degraded to the station of a consort.

Sargon took the field, probably in person, to aid the Mannai against this combination. After a preliminary expedition against Elli and Zikirtu, he found himself within the great mountain barrier which now forms the boundary between Persia and Turkey, and within striking distance of Muçaçir. Rusash hurried south, breaking through the Mannai, to come to the help of his ally. As Sargon advanced, Rusash took up his position on Mount Uaush. A battle was fought and Sargon was victorious, the body guard, two hundred and forty Haldians of the blood royal, being completely destroyed. Then, after a stop at Hubushkia to receive again the tribute of the *ianzu* of Nairi, he suddenly turned to the west and made a dash upon Muçaçir. The little mountain stronghold, confident in the inaccessibility of the direct road from Arbela, was taken in the rear by this dash through the Kelishin Pass, and captured. Urzana, its king, fled to Rusash and left his city to be plundered. The relief which Sargon erected to commemorate the plunder of the great temple and the carrying of the gods, Haldia and Bagabartu, into captivity, has been preserved and merits study. On it we have the temple with its curiously Greek pediment, its banded columns, its votive shields hung up in front, its great bull-footed lavers

in the forecourt, and its statue of a she wolf suckling her young in front. Here, too, we have the Assyrian soldiers climbing to the top or running along its sloping roof, while on a nearby tower an Assyrian officer sits on a camp-stool and the scribes stand before him to reckon up the spoil. And, indeed, they might reckon it in good earnest, for, if we could believe the Assyrian scribes themselves, the spoil from this little mountain village was greater than that taken from Carchemish, the great merchant city of the West!

Thus far we have followed the Assyrian account, and in general it has seemed trustworthy enough. Here it suddenly breaks off, and we have no further military information. Instead, we are told of the suicide of Rusash. It would be difficult to give a rational reason for this suicide, for a single defeat in the enemy's country and the capture of a god in a city a hundred miles away from his own capital is hardly enough. Fortunately, we have his own account to guide us from this point.

The greater part of the year had evidently been taken up with these operations. Winter was now coming on. With the scarcity of forage on these mountain heights, to winter in Muçaçir was impossible. Yet the direct road home through Arbela was impractical for an army, even if there was no enemy to harass his retreat. The only thing to do was to turn back and follow his old track. Rusash returned, re-established Urzana, and rebuilt the temple. The next year Rusash took the offensive and "went to battle to the Assyrian mountains". probably by the Arbela road. As no victories are claimed it may be presumed that none were gained. Rusash then erected a stele near Muçaçir detailing his version of the events. Later, perhaps in the year following, a fresh expedition by the Assyrians again succeeded in reaching the place and partially mutilated this record of their disgrace.

This is the last we hear of Rusash. His work was done, and Assyria had learned that Haldia was not to be conquered. He died about 711, and was succeeded by his son, Argishtish. Under this new ruler new conditions arose which must be discussed in a later chapter.

THE MEDIAN WARS

JUDGED RATHER BY THEIR results than by the details of their progress, the wars with the Median tribes, begun under Shalmaneser II in 836 and carried on by the later Assyrian kings with ever-decreasing hopes of success, deserve a large part in general history. Drifting westward as petty unconnected tribes, at war often with each other, they gradually drove in or conquered the more or less Assyrianized tribes along the eastern frontier, and then began to assail the empire itself. For a time the better trained Assyrian soldiers succeeded in beating them off, but the task was never-ending and the drain severe. The destruction of one clan meant only room for another to expand in, while all the time they were learning from the enemy. At last Assyria, now defended almost exclusively by mercenaries, themselves of Iranian extraction in many cases, fell, and then the collapse of Babylon was merely a question of time. Yet so thoroughly had they been transformed by the contact with their more civilized neighbors that, when at last they had conquered what was then the civilized world, they were found to stand for almost the same ideas in government and social life as did those who had preceded them in the way of empire. Here we have an interesting parallel in the evolution which led our Germanic ancestors from the idea of the rude chief with his band of personal attendants to the conception of the Holy Roman Empire. Interesting, however, as a study of these general movements may be, the details of this constant border warfare are dry to study and difficult to handle.

Thanks to the exertions of Tiglath Pileser III and to the provincial organization he brought to so high a pitch of efficiency, Sargon was well situated as regards these tribes. On the northeast and between Arbela and Muçaçir was the province of Kirruri which had been Assyrian territory since the ninth century. At this time the governor was Shamash upahhir. To the south of this was Parsuash, and again, to the south of this last, between the Lower Zab and the Diyala, on the first outliers of the eastern mountains, lay that of Arapha, now governed by Ishtar Duri. To the east of this was Lullume, an ill-defined province in the Shehrizor highland, whose governor, Sharru emur ani, whose residence probably was at the modern Suleimania, bore the brunt of the conflict.

We may now take up the operations in detail. First we have the operations of the governor of Parsuash (717). A number of towns of

the land Niksama were plundered, and Sipu sharru, the ruler of Shurgardia, probably a revolted subject, was captured. Lying as they did on the Parsuash frontier, they were naturally added to that province.

The governor next advanced to Kishesim, the most important town in the Parsuash region, and captured and carried off the komarch Bel shar ugur, whose name reminds us of the Biblical Belshazzar. The site of Kishesim seemed well adapted to be the seat of a province. The name was accordingly changed to Kar Adar, the Ashur cult introduced, and the usual stele erected. The new province whose capital Kar Adar became, embraced the greater part of the Parsuash region.

Troubles in Harhar next engaged the attention of the governor. Here the pro-Assyrian feelings of the komarch Kibaba had caused his expulsion, and Harhar was brought into close relation to Dalta of Elli. As that individual had not yet won the fame of a "loyal vassal who loved my yoke", praise so gladly given when Dalta was dead and the strife of his sons gave so good an opportunity for intervention, this was considered good ground for similar action here. To be sure, poor Kibaba was not reinstated. In fact, if we may accept one account, he was actually made captive himself. The city of Harhar, defended, as one of the reliefs shows, by an isolated rock citadel within the city, which itself was surrounded by a good-sized stream, was taken and plundered, its men impaled, and the usual procedure of setting up the stele, the introducing of the Ashur cult, and the settling of foreigners, gone through, while the name of the the place was changed to Kar Sharrukin, or Sargon's fortress. To the province thus formed were added the six small "states" now plundered and taken. At about the same time the governor in his new capital received the tribute from twenty-eight komarchs of the "mighty Medes"

In the next year, 716, the efforts to extend the province were continued. Some of the towns conquered the last year were again forced to pay tribute, while more new ones were visited. The details of some of these campaigns are shown in the bas-reliefs which once adorned the palace of Sargon. On one we see Kindau, a town with high walls around a great central tower. It is situated in a swamp across which a causeway leads to the town. On another we see Gauguhtu, a city on a hill with double walls against which mining operations are being carried on. A third shows us Kisheshlu with its double wall around a rocky hill surrounded by water, with three

battering rams working against them. These cities, once taken, were given Assyrian names and formed into Assyrian municipalities. Kar Sharrukin was again strengthened against the Medes, who still remained dangerous, even if twenty-two chiefs did send presents.

Indeed, the operations continued the next year, 715. The Mannai and Elli were once more forced to pay tribute, as well as certain princelets who had never done the like to the kings, his fathers. The main event of the year, however, was the defeat of Mitatti of Zikirtu, who had twice conspired to raise a revolt among the Mannai. At last, an attempt was made thoroughly to root out the Zikirtai. Their three strong places, their twenty-four towns, even their capital, Parda, was taken, plundered, and burned. Mitatti was forced to flee, and "his place of abode was not found". A few years later Zikirtai was once more in revolt.

Thus far we seem to be dealing only with the unknown governor of Parsuash. In 714 we learn of the operations of Sharru emur ani, the governor of LuUume. As a result of the troubles of 717, Karalla had been made part of the province. Under Amitashshi, the brother of the unfortunate Ashur liu, the natives rose and drove out their Assyrian oppressors. Sharru emur ani returned with an army, and a battle was fought on the mountain called Ana. The people of Karalla were defeated and Amitashshi, bound hand and foot, was carried off to Assyria, while two thousand of his troops were forced to take service in the royal army. Bit Daiukku and the surrounding lands were raided and plundered, and the whole of the newly-conquered region added to the Lullume province.

At about the same time operations were carried on along the Elli frontier, perhaps by Sharru emur ani, more probably by Ishtur Duri, the governor of Arapha. Dalta had now changed his policy; for the revolt of five of his border districts, seemingly to the Elamitish ruler, had forced him to invite the Assyrians to assist him. The Assyrians accepted gladly and secured the districts in question, but there is no proof that they were ever returned to Dalta. Elli was now brought fairly within the Assyrian sphere of influence, and only the death of Dalta was needed to produce actual intervention.

In this connection we are told of tribute received by the governor of Parsuash. This was probably not all taken in one year. It must rather represent the relations of that official with the tribes to the east during the interval for which we have no other history. Certain it is that we cannot see here actual expeditions in the field. Among the

tribes which sent presents were those of the Bikni or Demavend region, clearly near the Caspian and as clearly in a region where no Assyrian army ever penetrated. These were next neighbors to the somewhat mysterious Arabs of the east and of the land of Nagira of the "mighty" Mandai who had thrown off the yoke of Ashur and were encamped on mountain and steppe. The tribute received from Ullusunu of Mannai and of Adar aplu iddin was more in the nature of the real thing. But, again, in the tribute of several thousand horses and mules, sheep and cattle sent in by forty-five chiefs of the "mighty" Medes, we have only the usual presents.

Only once more does there seem to have been trouble along this frontier, and then it was not serious. By 708 Dalta of Elli had "gone the way of death," and his two sons, Nibe and Ishpabara, contested his throne. Nibe called in Shutruk nahunta, none the worse it would seem for his Assyrian wars, while his brother summoned Sargon. Shutruk nahunta sent four thousand five hundred bowmen to garrison Elli, but the seven generals of Sargon won the day. The capital, Marubishtu, situated on a high mountain, was captured and rebuilt, Nibe made prisoner, and Ishpabara placed on the throne.

The revolt of Ishpabara only six years later is only one indication among many of the untenable position the Assyrians held in Media. The attempt to hold back the advancing Median hordes was an impossible one, but Sargon did what he could and at least somewhat postponed the evil day.

THE ELAMITISH WARS AND THE CONQUEST OF BABYLON

THE CAMPAIGNS OF SARGON, after the first Babylonian troubles, fall into a definite series of movements. First came the settlement of Syrian affairs, then the advances on the northwest frontier and the struggles with Rusash and Midas. After this there had been no great movements, but constant wars along the Median and Asia Minor frontiers had exercised the troops as well as extended the boundaries. At the same time an opportunity was given for recuperation and for preparation for new wars.

The Median wars had already shown the influence of Shutur nahundi, who had ruled in Elam since 717. In Babylon, too, it was Elamitish support which helped to keep Merodach Baladan on the throne, and a movement to recover the old sacred city could not be better begun than by an attempt to disable the usurper's ally. Shutur nahundi held the same place in the affairs of the southeast as did Rusash in the north, Midas on the northwest, and Egypt on the southwest. Around each all the disaffection of that section centered and a conquest of each was essential to a lasting peace on that frontier.

It was therefore as a preliminary to the conquest of Babylon that Elam was invaded. Confused though the accounts are, we can yet, by the aid of the topography, give a fairly correct account of the operations. One division moved down southeast behind the Hamrin Hills, the first important elevation beyond the Babylonian plain, and attacked Dur Athara, a Gambulu fort only sixty miles from Susa itself and on the direct road between that city and Babylon. This important post had already been fortified by Merodach Baladan and was now still more strengthened. Its walls were raised, a canal from the Surappu river drawn about it, and a force of four hundred infantry and six hundred cavalry thrown in. In spite of all this preparation, the fort was quickly taken, before nightfall, the scribes of Sargon boast, and the usual prisoners and booty of live stock carried off. If the plan of Sargon had been to advance from here direct upon Susa, he was doomed to disappointment, for the road, though short, was too rough for an army easily to traverse it even in time of peace, while in the face of an enemy it was utterly impossible.

Something, however, had been accomplished. The direct road

between Susa and Babylon was held by Dur Athara which was made the capital of a new province, while Dur ilu held the Susians back from a return attack on Assyria. With the new capital as a base, further advances were made. One detachment, perhaps trying to go around the south end of the Hamrin chain and so attack Susa on the flank, invaded the Uknu region, where, among their reed beds and swamps, the natives felt secure. Nevertheless, their towns were taken and eight chiefs came forth from their retreat and paid tribute in livestock. All the region thus far taken was made a new province, that of Gambulu, with Dur Athara, now called Dur Nabu, as its capital. The nomads were ordered to settle, and a cash tribute added to a tax of one out of twenty from their flocks. This province seems to have been well Assyrianized, and Dur Nabu, unlike most of these re-christenings, long retained that name. Years later, when Gambulian exiles are found settled near Harran, we find a Dur Nabu as one of their foundations.

Next came the attempt to extend the province to the south as well as to the southeast, a movement of importance, as it brought the army close to the ancestral home of Merodach Baladan. Here was captured Qarad Nanni, a town of Nabu ugalla, six regions of the Gambulu, and four of their strongholds. Then, moving northeast, he attacked some of the greater tribes of the country, the Ru'a, the Puqudu, the Iatburu, and the Hindaru. From the two somewhat different accounts which the scribe has neglected to amalgamated we learn that they fled by night and occupied the morasses of the Uknu. The Assyrian army first devastated their land and cut down their main means of support, the date palms. Then they advanced into the swamp where they found the Dupliash dammed and fortified by two strongholds. An indecisive battle was fought, but surrender was finally forced by starvation. Fourteen towns on the banks of the Uknu, the names differ in the two versions, presented their tribute of livestock to the governor in Dur Athara. Hostages were taken, taxes assessed, and they, too, became part of the new province.

Parallel with all these operations of one corps were those of another, which had its base at Dur ilu, and which directed its attention to the country to the north of Elam proper, where Elamitish influence was still strong. Here again we have two conflicting versions. Two important places, Sam'una and Bab duri, were taken, though whether they were outposts which Shutur nahundi had fortified against Iatburu, as one of the versions would have us believe, or whether these were towns of Iatburu and it was the towns of

Ahilimmu and Pillutu that were Elamitish, as the other asserts, we cannot pretend to know. The commanders of these cities, Sadunu and Sinlishshibu, were forced to surrender, together with nearly twenty thousand soldiers, over a third of whom were Elamitish. In addition, there was taken much booty of wagons, horses, mules, asses, and camels. Samuna was rebuilt and named Bel ikisha. While still in camp here, tribute was received from a number of Iatburu chiefs whose tribes were settled on the banks of the Naditu. The operations came to an end with the conquest of certain important towns in Rashi, Til Humba, Dunni Shamash, Bube, and Hamanu. The inhabitants retired to Bit Imbi, which does not seem to have been taken, while Shutur nahundi, the instigator of all this resistance, retired to the mountains. That he should have been engaged here while the Assyrians further south were striving to find a road to his capital shows how safe he felt that to be behind its mountain walls. How thorough all this conquest was is shown by the fact that Sargon's own son, Sennacherib, informs us that some of it was already lost in the days of his father.

While these two divisions had been conquering the country east of the Tigris and thus driving a wedge between Elam and Babylonia, Sargon, with the main army, was moving directly upon Babylon. Here, for twelve years, Merodach Baladan had held his own. Even if not a native patriot, as the earlier scholars assumed, he was still looked upon as a foreign deliverer by a large anti-Assyrian party, whose property had been confiscated and who had been imprisoned during the last period of foreign rule. The majority of our documents come from the priestly class, who would naturally favor so pious a king as Sargon, but their version should not make us forget that there must have been a large military class and a still larger commercial one which was the natural enemy of Assyria.

In his inscriptions Sargon tells us that the Chaldaean usurper imprisoned the leading men of the land, although they had committed no crime, and confiscated their property. No doubt this is all true enough. But when Merodach Baladan did all this he was, only inflicting on the pro-Assyrian party severities which they themselves had employed on their rivals of the other party. In the royal charter granting lands to Bel ahe erba, we are told of lands torn from their rightful owners, of forgotten boundaries and destroyed boundary stones, and all this took place in the days when the Assyrian enemy devastated the land and "there was no king" in Babylon. Peaceable people must indeed have suffered when the land was torn between the

two factions, and could have had as little love for one as the other.

While, therefore, the accusations of the two enemies throw light on the conduct of each other, Sargon is deliberately telling an untruth, when he states that Merodach Baladan did not respect the gods, but removed them and allowed their sacrifices to fall into neglect. If the Babylonian priesthood remained hostile to the Chaldaean, it was from no lack of effort on his part to win them over. Like all other foreign conquerors of Babylon, he became a votary of the gods of the land. Thus, in the above-mentioned inscription, we have the same glorification of Marduk, Nabu and Ea, the same recognition of dependence on them, as we meet in those of the native rulers. Nor was this homage confined to words alone. He adorned and rebuilt the ancient temples, one of which was that of Nana at Uruk, and provided for their maintenance and their revenues. Special attention, too, was given to the ancient and revered cities of Sippar, Nippur, and Babylon. It is therefore probable that the mass of the people were well enough content with his rule. Otherwise, it is difficult to understand why he so easily won back Babylon so soon after Sargon died.

The settlement of Merodach Baladan at the gates of Assyria was a grave danger, for it was a constant incitement to the other subject states to follow the example of a successful revolt. In addition, there were sentimental reasons which would induce any Assyrian ruler, much more one so religious and so interested in antiquity as Sargon, to attempt the conquest. This constant desire to conquer the seemingly eternal city of Babylon, "seize the hands of Bel", and thus become the vice gerent of Marduk on earth, has been well compared with the equally constant desire of the Germanic kings to be crowned emperor at Rome. In many ways the attitude of respectful mastership assumed by Rome in her dealings with Greece would be a comparison more to the point. But neither is close enough. We have here no foreign countries separated as much by barriers of speech and custom as by sea or mountain. In its origin Assyria seems to have been a Babylonian colony. In language there was less difference than between Athens and Sparta. The only natural boundary was the line of the alluvium, and that was no barrier. On the other hand, the two great navigable rivers, the numberless canals, the roads with easy grades, all brought the two countries into close relations with each other. The result was what might have been expected. To the end Assyria was like Rome, the faithful copyist of Babylonia in most that did not relate to war or government. In art, in literature, in law, even in the trivial details of

every-day life, Assyria leaned upon Babylon. Above all, this was true of religion, although Assyria did indeed have a national Ashur cult. But even this could not prevent the older gods of the south from usurping to a considerable degree his place. The earlier Assyrian kings could ascribe victory to Ashur. The later ones did not feel their world empire sure until Bel Marduk of Babylon had allowed them to seize his hands in the "city of the lord of gods."

Sargon seems to have collected his troops at Ashur, which he perhaps inhabited at this time. He then would have moved down the west bank of the Tigris and crossed the Euphrates, probably at Falujah, where the last hills retreat from the river. From here he entered the country of Bit Dakkuri, not perhaps without a battle, where he found the ruined fort of Dur Ladina, about where we now have the sacred city of Kerbela. As this was a good outpost against Babylon, it was rebuilt and garrisoned. The position of Merodach Baladan had now become untenable. On the west, Dur Ladina, on the north Kutha were in the hands of the Assyrians, and each was but a few miles from Babylon. On the east the whole of the Elamitish foothills had fallen into their hands, and a part of their troops was already working their way through the swamps toward Dur Iakin and threatening his rear.

He was accordingly forced to retreat. At first he withdrew to Iatbur along the Tigris. From here he sent a "tribute," as the Assyrian writer sarcastically calls his presents to Shutur nahundi, begging for Elamitish aid. The Assyrian insinuates that Shutur nahundi did not come, because he did not wish to, and portrays with deep feeling the scene which took place when Merodach Baladan learned the news, how he threw himself on the ground, tore his clothes, and filled the air with his loud lamentations. As we have already seen, the Elamite king was busy in the north at this time and perhaps did not know of the plight of his ally. Besides, he had all the fighting he needed in this part of the field.

As Merodach Baladan was unable by himself to break through to Elam and as Shutur nahundi could not or would not come to his aid, he was forced to fall back along the Tigris to Iqbi Bel, perhaps the present Amara.

With the retreat of Merodach Baladan, Babylon opened its gates. In long procession, the citizens of Babylon and Borsippa, magistrates, trade guilds, artisans, carried to Sargon, as he lay encamped at Dur hadina, the greeting of the great gods, Bel Marduk and Zarpanit, Nabu

and Tashmit. The envoys were received graciously by the pious monarch, who showed by his sacrifices his respect for the old order of things. It was now late in the year, and New Year's Day was approaching. Sargon resolved to "seize the hands of Bel" himself and thus assume personal rule over Babylon. For the approaching ceremony the old canal of Borsippa was restored in order that it might be used as the festival street along which Nabu might pass to greet Marduk on this auspicious day.

Sargon now went into winter quarters at Babylon where the tribute of some of the Arimi, or Aramaeans, of the Bit Amukani, and of Bit Dakkuri, was received. At the same time the conquest of North Babylonia was completed by the subjugation of the Hamarana, one of the "helper" tribes of Merodach Baladan. They had retreated across the Euphrates before the Assyrian advance and established themselves in Sippar. The Babylonians attempted to drive them out, but failed. An Assyrian force was detached from the main body and sent under a governor against them. A wall of circumvallation was thrown around Sippar and the Hamarana were forced to surrender.

The great prize was now Sargon's. On New Year's Day he "seized the hands of Bel" and became king of Babylon with all due pomp and ceremony. A month was still needed for the settlement of Babylon, and then, in the month of May, he set out for his final attack on Merodach Baladan. On his advance, the Chaldaean fell back to Dur Iakin in the marshes of the Mar Marrati, the swamps at the head of the Persian Gulf. Here he prepared to make his last stand. The nomad troops were collected, the city fortified, and a canal from the Euphrates brought around the place, the bridges destroyed, and the whole country made a morass by the breaking down of the dams. Outside the walls, earthworks were thrown up and troops posted in them.

"Like eagles" Sargon's troops crossed the streams and advanced to the attack. The nomads were forced back and a hand-to-hand conflict took place before the walls. Merodach Baladan was wounded in the arm and obliged to take refuge within the city. His troops, nevertheless, Puqudu, Marsamai, Sute, resisted to the last and were slaughtered before the gate. Rich booty was taken, including the king's furniture and plate, in addition to captives and the various domestic animals. For three days the city was given over to plunder. Then it was burned, its towers thrown down, its very foundations torn up, and the place given over to utter ruin.

Yet the real object of the expedition was not accomplished. Merodach Baladan escaped, as one of the versions is forced to admit. Other versions, indeed, give the history as it should have been, with Merodach Baladan as a captive or as a pardoned rebel with his tribute paid and his fortresses dismantled, but the course of later events proves that he did indeed escape. He remained safe in the marshes of the extreme south until Sargon died, when once more, for a short time, he held the throne of Babylonia.

The remainder of the year was taken up with the settlement of affairs in South Babylonia. The political prisoners from Babylon, Sippar, Nippur, and Borsippa, were freed from their confinement at Dur Iakin and restored to their homes and lands. Religion once more became supreme. The gods were restored to the cities and new buildings erected. The whole of the region along the Elamitish border, Dur Iakin included, was settled by captives from Qummuh, hardly a wise proceeding for the change from the cold bracing highlands along the upper Euphrates to the hot, fever-laden swamps of this region must have soon proved fatal to the majority of them. A strong fort was built against Elam at Sagbat by Nabu damiq ilani, who seems to be the governor of Gambulu mentioned immediately after. The control of this frontier was confided to him and to the governor of Babylon.

At almost the same time Sargon's vanity was flattered by "tribute" from two distant islands at the two extreme corners of the known world. We have already seen the reason for his relations with Cyprus. What led Uperi, king of Tilmun, a half mythical island lying a sixty hours' journey down the gulf, "like a fish in the sea", to open relations with Sargon is not so clear. Probably it was for commercial reasons. If Tilmun was indeed the present Bahrein, we may perhaps see in it a wish to secure a market for the pearls which have made the island so famous in modern times.

Sargon remained for some time in Babylonia, receiving the submission of the natives and attempting to put affairs in order. In 707 all seemed to be quiet, or at least matters were becoming more serious to the north. The king returned to Assyria, after having brought back the gods of the sea lands to their ancestral seats, taking with him a body of captives to be settled there. But these northern troubles seem once more to have aroused the south, and the settlers placed in Dur Iakin were driven out in 706. In 705 we have the news of a capture of Dur Iakin. By this time it would seem as if South Babylonia was all in revolt. For a time Sennacherib was able to hold

Babylon and the North, but even this finally went over to Merodach Baladan, who once more for a short while held rule over all Babylonia.

THE LAST YEARS

WITH THE ACCESSION OF Argishtish II to the throne of Haldia, about the year 711, the situation became once more as serious as it had been under Rusash. As usual, the new king was more anxious for war than his father, and hostilities, which seem to have been intermitted for two or three years, broke out anew. The first year or two of his reign seems to have been spent in building for himself a new city, Argishtihina, whose ruins are probably to be found at Arjish, and in constructing a reservoir for it.

In 710 the opportunity seemed to have come. Sargon was in Babylonia with his best troops and engaged with powerful enemies who, if allied with Argishtish, as seems to have been the case, would no doubt call upon him to make a diversion. For the events of these last few years we depend, not on the edited documents intended to glorify the king, but on the very letters which passed between the generals in the field and the king himself or his son, Sennacherib, who was left in charge of the north with head-quarters at Kalhu, while his father was at Babylon. Thus, in spite of the difficulty of interpretation and of arrangement, we are enabled to gain a far more correct and more vivid idea of the campaigns than we can for any other part of the reign. Our first letters would seem to come from the winter of 710-9, when Sargon was already in control of Babylon. At this time Argishtish seems to have been collecting his troops at his new city of Argishtihina, which lay on the north side and might therefore be supposed to be out of sight from the Assyrians. But Sargon had a good intelligence department, and rumors began to reach him. Ashur rigua, for example, who so often appears in these events, was ordered to send one of his spies to Turushpa, the older capital of Haldia, on the site of the present Van, whence a raid might be expected. As a result, perhaps, of this investigation, Ashur ri#ua next learned that Argishtish had now entered Turushpa and had there captured the second tartan, Urgine, with his Assyrian army. The tartan, it would seem, had advanced incautiously, thinking that the Haldian was still at Argistihina. Now his brother, Apli uknu, had gone off to see him, presumably under a truce, and was about to investigate the cause of the capture. The near approach of the Haldian army had quite naturally led to disaffection among Sargon's soldiers, many of them captives who had seen their homes destroyed and relatives killed by the men who now forced them to fight their cause. Narage, a *rab kiçir*,

plotted revolt, and was followed by twenty of his men. Ashur riḡa, however, detected it in time and the plotters were sent back from the front. Another example of the disaffection felt may be seen in a letter from Sha Ashur dubbu, governor of Tushhan. Two officers and six men were sent with warrants, seal in hand, the Assyrian says, for deserters in Penza on the Haldian frontier. While on their way they fell into an ambush set by a Shuprian whose brother had just been treacherously eating with them to throw them off their guard. Fortunately they escaped. The governor has ordered a guard, for he has cavalry as well as infantry, to be stationed here and will carry on a full investigation. Another letter of his gives further news of the Penza affair, it would seem, as well as of conditions on the frontier. A messenger of Bagteshub has brought news from the front, but Bagteshub himself has not obeyed orders, and a copy of the reprimand sent him is given.

Frontier conditions were certainly growing alarming. Akkul anu was cut off and besought the king for a reply. Another letter from Upahhir Bel, governor of Ameda, reports that he is still in Harda and has sent a scout to the frontier. The governor of an unknown city, perhaps Akku-lanu, has sent asking aid. Upahhir Bel replies by urging him to remain shut up close in his forts and he will deliver him. But this must have been a boast which Upahhir Bel was unable to fulfill, for when we next hear of him he has been forced to fall back, and Haldian officials are at Harda, his old quarters. From here to Turushpa, where the king still was, they keep guard. There is no immediate danger of attack, for a captured letter from Argishtish to the governor of Harda forbids for the present further advance. The Ituai, who seem to have been a sort of military caste, have been called in. The palace Ituai who has come from the Euphrates has gone off with one or two "houses" of the governor's *sukalli*. The Ituai who inspected beams at Eziat has been sent off with the *rob ali*, or mayor, to the front. An engagement has taken place and the Assyrians have been worsted. The enemy lost only three wounded, while the Assyrians suffered a loss of two killed and ten wounded, including the lieutenant of the *rab ali*. Upahhir Bel is now at Shuruba and must have an army there by harvest time to support him.

But still worse news was to come to Sennacherib, for while Argishtish was still at Turushpa sacrificing, and with all his governors around him, ready for an advance, the Mannai, whose traditional policy was to side with Assyria, broke away and made a raid on

Assyrian territory. Analu-qunu, the governor of Muçaçir, and Tunnaun, governor of Karsitu, hastened to the boundary, but the Mannai had already retreated. Such was the news of Ashur riçua. Gabbu ana Ashur, who had arrived at his province of Kurban, in Tammuz (July), sends in a report a month later, in Ab. On his arrival he sent messengers to Nabu liu, Ashur bel danan, and Ashur riçua, who were at the forts immediately before the enemy. Now the messengers have returned and report that Argishtish is still in Turushpa. From another letter we learn that there were ten Assyrian generals operating in this region. About the same time must have taken place the revolt of the Zikirtai.

The events of this year had been most favorable for Haldia. On the northwest Mutallu of Qummuh had been drawn away. Then along the whole southern boundary of Haldia an advance had been made and disaffection was spreading in the enemy's ranks. The situation seemed black enough for Assyria, with even the Zikirtai and their faithful Mannai gone.

The operations of the next year, 708, were no more calculated to restore confidence to Sargon. At the beginning of Nisan (April), Argishtish at last advanced, first to Qaniun and then to Eliggadu where he was met by the levy from all Armenia. Meanwhile, Qaqqadanu, his tartan, had been sent on to Uesi with four other officers. After a long delay, during which he received the tribute of the Zikirtai, the king left Eliggadu and himself went to Uesi. His forces at this time were said to be few. By this time it was already Elul (September). Here he seems to have remained until the beginning of the next year. But while still in Uesi, apparently before the winter closed in, he sent against Muçaçir a body of three thousand men with baggage camels under Setinu, one of his governors. But Suna, the Assyrian general in charge of the Ukkai country, who had already put down a revolt at home, learned of this and hurried to Muçaçir to head him off. This he succeeded in doing, although not before the enemy had crossed the Çalmat river. This was the first victory, it would appear, of all the operations. An attempt was made to push the advantage home. The commanders of Uesi and Ukkai, the latter Suna, of course, came to Muçaçir, sacrificed in the famous temple, and then advanced, the result being that Argishtish fell back to Uesi. This information was sent the king by no less a person than Urzana, king of Muçaçir, the former friend of Rusash. He now protests his loyalty and his wish to do whatever the king orders him. This success of the

Assyrians must have been followed by a reverse, for soon after we find Urzana negotiating a treaty with Haldia and his example followed by Hubushkia. Hardly, however, had the spring campaign of 707 begun when Argishtish was suddenly drawn to the north by a terrible danger which now began to threaten the civilized countries of Western Asia. Another branch of that Iranian race which was already pressing so hard on the eastern frontier of Assyria had poured across the Caucasus, carrying everything before it. Coming out of their "Cimmerian darkness", these Gimirrai, so soon as the late spring of the highlands allowed, began their operations. They struck the Haldian frontier obliquely and finally took up their position in Cappadocia, where many traces of their stay lasted on in the later nomenclature of the region. Here they were able to attack, as they might desire, Phrygia or the rising power of Lydia on the one hand, or Assyria or Haldia on the other. The land of Haldia first felt the presence of these barbarians and Argishtish decided to attack them before they actually crossed his borders. At first he seems to have had some success. Guriania, a region between Haldia and Gamirra, was forced to pay tribute. As the Haldian advance must have been up the Tokhma Su past Melitene and Tuglarimmu, this whole country must have already been lost to Assyria. It is therefore with no surprise that we see Sennacherib engaged once more in reconquering this region.

The advantage did not long remain to Argishtish. Soon after he entered the land of Gamir, the battle with the Cimmerians took place. The result was a complete defeat. The king himself escaped and retreated to Uzaun, but his tartan, Qaqqadanu, was taken and most of his nobles slain. The defeat was a terrible one. The wars with Assyria had already weakened Haldia, and now this came. The country was permanently crippled and never again became a serious menace to Assyria.

The news spread far and wide, and soon reports from the various frontier officers began to come in to Sennacherib, who forwarded them to Sargon, who was still delaying in Babylon. The news seems to have aroused him, for by the end of the year 707 he was once more back in Assyria. The next year he himself took the field in Tabal, though now an old man. For a time there seems to have been no decisive battle, the Cimmerians probably being weakened by their late contest, while Sargon would follow a more cautious policy. But in the year 705 he was forced to give battle to the Cimmerians, who seem now to have been led by Eshpai the Kulummite. The king fell in the

ensuing conflict and his camp was taken. Later his body was recovered and, after much opposition for some unknown cause by the priests, his son buried it with all the necessary pomp. On the twelfth of Ab (August) Sennacherib formally ascended the throne and a new reign began.

THE CULTURE LIFE

IN A HISTORICAL STUDY, even as brief and as confined in its limits as this, some attention must be paid to the culture history. Always more difficult to investigate than political history, it is especially so when an attempt must be made to indicate what were the lines of development in so short a time. If we were to take the reign of Sargon as typical of Assyria and were to present a fairly complete picture of the general civilization of the age, it might be allowable to draw from the more abundant data relating to the later Sargonid days. As the present production is a study rather than a complete presentation, this chapter will contain merely certain observations on the civilization of the reign of Sargon.

In the preceding chapters almost exclusive attention has been given to the military history. To a large extent this has been forced by the nature of our sources, which are largely war annals. But we are not called upon especially to regret this. To a nation so essentially warlike, the military history is the most important as well as the most typical. The real Assyrian race was only a conquering caste settled among a conquered population and constantly forced to extend its territories, since no real frontier could be found. Under these conditions, racial solidarity was demanded, as well as constant preparation for war, and to secure this, as at Sparta, all else was subordinated to the military life. The whole essence of life was military and can be understood only in this light. Even business and religion took on military forms. The great mission of Assyria in the pre-classical period, as of Rome in the classical, was the dissemination by arms of the culture of an earlier civilization. With less adequate a basis in the native population and with smaller powers of organization and assimilation, it had less success, yet the period when the older civilizations were amalgamated to so large an extent in its empire must be considered one of the germinative periods of human history. Nor must we forget that it is to these very war annals that we owe much of our knowledge of customs, of the history, perhaps even the existence of important Asiatic peoples.

In a people thus settled as a conquering caste among a non-Semitic race, all depended naturally upon the army. In the earlier days this had consisted of only the feudal levy, "the people in arms", and survivals existed on into the reign of Sargon. But by this time the energy which had once enabled them to send off colonies to settle

conquered districts was gone. The attempted conquest of the world had proved too much for Assyrian resources, and at this period Assyria was just recovering from one of her seasons of exhaustion. No doubt Sargon was doing the only thing he could when he changed, if, indeed, to him belongs the credit, from the old feudal levy to a standing army. We must not measure the wisdom of this departure by the success of standing armies in modern times, for centralization then coincided with the growth of national sentiment and of a healthy social condition. Here there was no free peasant or commercial class to fall back upon, and, with the decay of the old feudal nobility and their followers, the standing army could be recruited only from captives, from slaves, or from mercenaries. Of the first method we have sufficient proof. As has been noted in other chapters, the usual proceeding after the conquest of a place was to enroll the captured soldiers into the royal army. Furthermore, there are references in the letters to soldiers of various nationalities, who, however, are combined, so far as possible, to break up racial feeling and to substitute corps spirit. In some cases, as at Carchemish, there were probably mercenaries who were taken over, at any rate, there seem to have been foreign mercenaries enlisted. From the business documents we know that slaves were subject to requisition by the military as by the civil authorities. For a time, at least, the new arrangement succeeded in spite of the poorer material. The new army could be better organized and better directed than the old. The unit seems to have been the *fifty*, that is, of fifty groups, each consisting of a spearman and bowman, and to this a few chariots and cavalry were attached, the whole being under a captain of fifty. These groups again were under a higher officer, generally the governor of the region they were operating in. In addition, there seems to have been a royal body guard, its members generally Assyrians, composed of chariots, foot and cavalry. Individual members seem to have held important commissions and even commanded other troops in war. A good intelligence department existed and intelligence officers, scouts, and spies are mentioned in the letters. Siege engines were much used, as the reliefs show. The leaders understood something of tactics, and those who follow up their expeditions on the map cannot deny a certain knowledge of strategy. There seem to have been general plans for the campaigns, which were often carried on along an extended frontier, where cooperation of the operating bodies was needed.

At the head of the government was the king. In theory, his will seems to have been absolute, though tempered in practice by a goodly

number of revolts. There is no proof that there was any council regularly constituted to advise him, but there are indications that the nobles had much influence and were not afraid to speak their mind on occasion. Around the king was a large circle of high officials at the head of whom was the tartan, corresponding to the wazir of modern Turkey. For the earlier part of the reign this was Ashur içka danin, a man probably as old as Sargon himself, since he was eponym in 720. He was assisted by a second and perhaps a third tartan. How important his personality was we cannot tell, for in his earlier period Sargon would have been active enough to carry on his own affairs, while from 710 at least Sennacherib was in charge of Assyria proper, and was in direct control of the operations against Haldia. Another official whose influence must have been great was Tab çil esharra, who occupied the post of governor of Ashur, the mother city of Assyria and the especial favorite of Sargon for the greater part of his reign. Still another was Ashur bani, governor of Kalhu, where the king for a good portion of his time held his court.

The cities of Assyria, then, had their governors, but seem to have had, at least so far as the citizens were concerned, a position superior to that of the ordinary provincials. The same was true of the culture nations of Mesopotamia and Babylon, which, however often they revolted, were never made actual provinces, but were rather united in a sort of personal union where the only bond, at least in theory, was the fact that they had a common ruler. Although this theory did not represent the true state of affairs, yet it had a considerable influence on it. Mesopotamia was gradually becoming more and more a part of Assyria, and it would appear that Shalmaneser had attempted to make the transformation complete by taking away the ancient rights of Harran, the capital, perhaps by taking away all rights to a separate government. Sargon came to the throne as a result of a reaction, and his first care was to restore the lost rights to Harran, and he regularly employed throughout his reign the title "King of the World", which was the ancient title of the kings of Mesopotamia.

But, while Mesopotamia was thus being Assyrianized, it was different in Babylonia which, even yet, was so frequently its own ruler that it had not forgotten what freedom meant. The whole country had forgotten largely its old rivalries and now rallied around Babylon. It could never forget that it was older and more civilized than Assyria, and this natural prejudice Sargon, as a believer in the good old times, and perhaps also as an astute statesman, respected. He "seized the

hands of Bel" with due ceremony and thus became their own personal ruler. Unlike the other Assyrian kings who ruled Babylon thus, there was no need of a change of name, for what name more suggestively Babylonian, smacking of the olden time, could be found than Sargon? Such stress, indeed, was laid in Babylonia on the fact of his being the "second" Sargon that his name as a king of that country only came down to Greek times as Arkeanos, "the Second". Thus, so long as Sargon ruled Assyria, Babylonia was safe, for he had the support of the priestly faction, and that was dominant. But when Sennacherib, himself devoted rather to the military party in Assyria, came to the throne the priestly party in Babylonia had no choice but to take the less of two evils and, with their own military party, once more invoke the aid of Merodach Baladan.

Outside the culture states thus protected by the Assyrians were the barbarians. Some of them had long ago been conquered and had been incorporated into the provincial system. Others were under control of "allied kings", who for a time were supported by the Assyrians until at length the usual family troubles marking a new accession should force intervention and annexation. In the preceding pages we have seen something of the manner this provincial system worked. We have noted the way each governor in turn gave his name to the year and have seen that he was often the conductor of a war or able to show in other ways his independence on the frontier. The number of these governors was nearly sixty, a sufficient proof of the smallness of their province. In this, no doubt, we see a wise attempt to limit the amount of danger likely to result from revolt, a policy in considerable contrast to that of the Persians. Nor was this the only check. The constant letters showed a highly centralized government. With a royal post and trained couriers the results would probably not be far different from that centralization which the telegraph gives the Turkish Sultan, for, like him, the Assyrian king in his letters deals with the minutest details. Rarely do we have the letters sent by the king, but how frequent these must have been we see from the constant phrase, "As to what you sent about". But the more distant governors, such as those of Que or Samaria, must have had far more opportunity to show independent ability or to plan revolt. To the Assyrian monarch as to the Sultan today, the main function of a government was the levying of taxes, and the provinces must have groaned under the burden. To what extent the home land was freed we do not know. It would appear that about this time a definite budget was first made out, for from this period we have lists of tribute due from the various

provinces as well as an account of the various objects for which the sums were to be appropriated. While the general lines of provincial administration are now fairly known, a thorough study of the system is still needed.

From the earliest times Babylonia had law codes and an elaborate legal machinery, caused by its great trading interests as well as by a primitive factory system operated by slave labor. Assyria was less of a trading nation, although there must have been some traders, and commercial motives can be traced at times in the campaigns of the reign. As a rule, the main commercial interest of such an expedition must have been the booty, and such an attitude must have had as evil an effect on the development of the real resources of the country as the influx of the easily won American gold had on Spain. The preceding period of break-up seems to have left Assyrian industry in a bad way, and we hear of decaying villages and of agricultural apparatus out of commission, even the canals, so absolutely essential for the welfare of the country, being no longer fit to be used. All this, so Sargon boasts, he changed. The villages he rebuilt, the canals he opened, the waters he stored, were a real blessing to the country, as was the bringing of new sections under cultivation. But he clearly did not understand the real issues. The decline of an agricultural population was no doubt due to the same causes which operated in the later Roman republic. With this came finally a rise in prices, aided, no doubt, by the large amount of precious metals brought in by the successful wars. Sargon naturally felt this to be due to conspiracy on the part of the Aramaean traders in whose hands was now the greater part of the trade of the empire. One of his proudest boasts is the way he made a tariff so that the necessities of life might be accessible to all, wine for the sick, incense for the joy of the heart, oil for wounds, while sesame was the same price as grain.

The immense number of business documents from Babylonia have given a very vivid picture of the social life there. Unfortunately, we are practically without examples of ordinary Assyrian trading documents, although this is made partially good by the large number of such documents coming from the court itself. Preceding pages have shown how these occasionally throw a gleam of light on the history and especially on the great personages who played a part at court. Here, again, the number actually coming from this reign is small, a considerable contrast to the letters. So far as we can see, we have the same conditions as in later reigns. The references to the eponyms or to

other governors are often of value, while the lists of witnesses ranging from high officials to slaves give an insight into the composition of the social system.

Around the king was a regular official hierarchy with a definite arrangement of precedence. Thanks to the above-mentioned documents, we are now beginning to understand something of their work and of their rank, but much still is dark. Below them were the freemen, who held land by the bow, the feudal obligation to fight the wars of their lord. Probably there was a free proletariat as well, though there seems no proof. By this time the number of free Assyrians must have grown much smaller. To the free population must also be added the foreign trader. The mass of the population was unfree, slaves or serfs. On all the lands of Assyria were these serfs, bound to the soil and passing to a new owner with it. In theory, the position of the serf might seem an advance on that of the slave. In practice, the serfs on the great estates which the king had granted by royal charter to his favorite nobles, and who by the labor of their hands made the garden of the world of the Babylonian swamps and the Mesopotamian steppes, were probably inferior socially as well as mentally to the city slaves who were engaged in industry, often indeed under what might almost be called factory conditions, or even in independent trade, paying a sort of annual tax to the nominal owner. We even find one slave owning another. In general, slavery was mild. If the political conditions are much like those obtaining near the end of the Roman empire, there is an equally close similarity in the underlying social causes. The original nobility, even the original free people, was dying out, foreigners held the trade and even important government posts. The slaves were improving their condition, at least in the cities, but the serfs, the representatives partly of an old free agricultural population, perhaps more, in both cases, of the gradually rising-body of slaves on the great estates, to which the fewer and fewer free men were dragged down by the competition of slave labor. There is certainly a sufficient amount of coincidence here to make the study of both agreements and differences as well as of the underlying causes, extremely interesting.

Whatever their attitude towards other lines of work, the Assyrians never allowed any but themselves or their Babylonian teachers to hold religious offices. With their usual ability as copyists, they took over the whole Babylonian system with its pantheon of gods, old and young, its demons, its ritual and its exorcisms in the obsolete

Shumerian tongue. Yet, however carefully the Assyrians copied Babylonian models, Assyrian religion was something as different as was the altered political horizon to which the old star omens were fitted. Other gods might have their cults, but the real, the national god of Assyria, whose worship sometimes almost reaches monotheism, was Ashur, "the father of the gods", the embodied nation. Sargon was brought to the throne by the aid of the priesthood and ever honored it. But his honor was especially given to Ashur, and this made him a good patriot and an ardent soldier, for it was in "the might of Ashur" that an Assyrian king went forth to battle and each newly organized province was at once given its images of the king and of Ashur, a curious anticipation of the provincial worship of "Rome and Augustus". We can better understand his partiality for Ashur, if that god was his patron saint from whom he was named, for it has been suggested with some plausibility that his name, which is incomplete as it stands, was originally Ashur shar ukin. As he was especially interested in Harran, he naturally cared for its patron, Sin, the moon god. A trace of this is surely to be found in the fact that Sin is invoked in the name of his son Sennacherib. As suzerain of Babylon, he naturally would also pay great attention, as already seen, to Bel Marduk, of Babylon, and Nabu, of Borsippa, as well as to their consorts Zarpanit and Tashmit. These were the great gods of the nation, but others were highly honored. The new Dur Sharrukin was to hold, in addition to those already mentioned, shrines of Ea, the old water god, Shamash, the sun god of Sippar, Adad, the thunderer, and Ninib of Kalhu, as well as their consorts. Ishtar, in Assyria rather the goddess of war than of love, was rather neglected by Sargon, though one of the gates of the new city is named after her and we hear of offerings to her. We also have a hymn to Nana which is attributed to this ruler. Anu and Dagan have a very prominent part in the invocations opening the inscriptions, though just why Sargon was the "man" of these gods and not of Sin when he freed Harran I cannot understand. Other gods referred to are Damqu and Shar ilani, the brother gods of the town where Dur Sharrukin was built, and Shaushepi, a Mitanian goddess settled at Nineveh. This religious character, as already noted, was very pleasing to the priestly party, and Sargon's reputation was made accordingly. The strongly anti-hierarchical reign of his son Sennacherib made a sharp and favorable contrast, so that, when once more the religious section gained control under Esarhaddon, we are not surprised to find the statement made in a letter to the king that there has been no justice in the land since the

days of Sargon.

In religion there was a certain tendency to following the older paths, and this naturally showed itself in literature, or at least in that branch of it which fell under priestly control. It has been assumed that, because nearly all our literary documents were found in the palace of Ashurbanipal, the copying of all is therefore due to him. I do not see how a certain element of truth can well be refused to this, for a large number bear his name in the colophon. But the fact that so large a number of the letters and business documents found there came from the same place, and yet date earlier, should give us pause, and this is confirmed by what few clues we are able to discover. Sargon evidently had a library, for we find an inscription with his "library mark", and perhaps if we had before us the texts cited in the Catalogue as belonging to Sargon's time we should find others. To one scholar or patron of scholars, Nabu zuqub kini, son of Marduk shum iqisha, whose very names, compounded with the gods interested in all this work, show their position, we owe much, for already some fifteen tablets can be definitely ascribed to him, while others of the same sort from this reign may with probability be attributed to the same person. The most important of the old works he caused to be copied was the "Illumination of Bel", with the elder Sargon we have already noted. Two recensions of this are known, one copied in Sargon's time, the other in the days of Ashurbanipal. Of the former, seven tablets have thus far been identified, dating from 716 to 705. Isolated tablets from other series are known to have been copied for him, astrological forecasts, observations on the moon, star observations, prayers, tablets containing directions for the cult. A number of other tablets can be placed in this reign.^

We have already seen the political reasons which led the scribes of Sargon to write down the floating legends about the elder Sargon. The omen list is as dry as such works are; the story of his birth and early life is probably the finest piece of literature written in cuneiform, simple folk tale though it is.

The most characteristic literature of the Babylonians was religious. The war annals gave way to the hymn to the god. In Assyria the greatest importance was given to the display of the king's might in war, but nothing has as yet been found comparing at all with the wide interests, local and chronological, of the Babylonian Chronicle. In general, we find these glorifications of the king, whether confined to mere lists of titles and unmeaning phrases, or supported by the great

deeds he claims to have done, a little dull reading. And yet it is not all dull, for now and then our attention is drawn from the bare data to some picturesque expression which shows us we have still to do with the race which produced the book of Job and the Arabian Nights. In the outlook on life we have an almost Homeric attitude, that of a race civilized, but not yet sophisticated. Frequently the similes are taken from nature. Sargon roars like a lion, his troops rush to the attack like eagles, his enemies fly away like birds, the devastation of the land is like that caused by locusts. Islands lie like fish in the sea. Again there are similes from the simple life round about. There are often references to the yoke laid upon the enemy or of friends who loved his yoke. Sibû fled away like an unfaithful shepherd abandoning his flocks. The destruction is so complete that the remains will be only as the pottery crushed to powder to make mortar. The Cypriotes are dragged like fish from the waters. Picturesque phrases are used. Rusash was a helper who could not help. Iranzu went the "way of death," while as for Dalta, "his fate came upon him". Merodach Baladan was an evil spirit. Very picturesque are the accounts of the suicide of Rusash and the despair of Merodach Baladan, the most picturesque, perhaps, because the scribe was not fettered in the flights of his imagination by facts. The frequent formulae, such as "I pulled down, I tore up, with fire I burned", also give a sort of Homeric touch. Yet perhaps the most impressive thing about these war annals is the straightforward way in which events are described, the mode of narration of a people which feels that it is doing great deeds and needs no literary adornment to enhance them.

Of all the arts, architecture is most closely connected with history and the Assyrians were a building nation. Partly this was caused by emulation of Babylonia, where ages of construction had left a vast heritage of noble edifices, partly by the wish of the rulers to utilize their booty in erecting memorials to their greatness, partly to the unsubstantial character of these memorials, which were constantly falling into disrepair and so made a new erection almost as easy as the preparation of one for renewed occupation. Sargon was a true Assyrian in this respect. In the provinces he built extensively from the frontier fort to the palace at Carchemish. Hardly a city was captured but what was rebuilt, and a mere catalogue of these alone would give an impressive idea of his building operations.

It would appear that, at the beginning of his reign, Sargon resided at the city of Ashur he so favored, and later we know that the palace

there was repaired by Tab gil esharra the governor of that city. During the greater part of the reign the royal headquarters were at Kalhu, further north, where a number of the Assyrian kings, beginning with Shalmaneser I, had resided. An old palace of Ashurnasirpal which had fallen into decay was restored and adorned with the booty of Carchemish. As late as 707, when Sargon was in Babylon, Sennacherib, as regent of Assyria, still resided in Kalhu. Nineveh was not the favored city it became under his successors, but we find him repairing there a temple to Nabu and Marduk originally erected by Adad 7 nirari, and residence for a time here seems to be indicated. At Tarçig, the modern Sherif Khan, a palace was erected, later repaired by Esarhaddon. At Karamles, to the east of Nineveh, an important part of the Assyrian triangle, Sargon followed the example of Shalmaneser in building. The Assyrian Chronicle gives the restoration of two temples, one in 722-721, the other in 719-714. The latter was a Nergal temple, and seems to have been the great one at Kutha, which probably was at this time in Sargon's possession. An interesting letter is one from Ishtar Duri forwarding the complaint of Shamash bel uçur, eponym in 711, who is at Der, and has no inscriptions to put on the temple at that place. Again, we learn that the palace of the queen at Kakzi was in ruins. The king was asked if it should be repaired. Evidently Sargon was unable to execute the work, for it was not done until 704, a year after his death.

Thus Sargon was much engaged in building. But the production of such comparatively minor works did not satisfy him. The elder Sargon had had his city of Dur Sharrukin named after him and he would do likewise. Looking around, he found an appropriate locality at Magganuba, a half-ruined town to the northeast of Nineveh, at the foot of the barren Musri hills. The soil around was largely clay, providing a good and cheap building material. The ground was fertile, at present two crops of cereals are raised each year and a large part exported to Baghdad. Trees grew there then and from the sculptures we learn of palms, olives, figs, and oranges in this region. The waters are medicinal, being strongly charged with sulphur, and this may have had something to do with the old king's choice of a site.

We are fortunate in having several copies of the act of expropriation and of compensation which was given at Nineveh, thus, for a time at least, the seat of the court, in Simanu, 711. The land required for the new city was not taken without compensation. Those who wished it were paid in cash the price their estates had cost them,

as proved by the tablets relating to the purchase. Those who preferred lands were given them in other parts of the country. To the latter type belong our documents. Adad nirari had granted one of these fields to three men, Ianuni, Ahu lamur, and Mannuki Abi. They were to hold it on very easy terms, merely a payment of ten homers of barley to Ashur and Bau. Now Mannuki Abi, who was still alive, and the children of the others were granted in exchange ninety-five homers of land in a priestly city near Nineveh for the same consideration, and this was to hold for their descendants.

The city which, with the palace, was probably the work of Tab shar Ashur, the chief architect, was laid out in the form of a rough rectangle, nearly two thousand yards long on each side, and was approximately oriented with its corners to the cardinal points, a proceeding no doubt due to a wish not to receive too directly the blazing summer sun. The city was led up to by a roughly paved road forty feet wide, a very respectable width for the east, and was continued beyond the gate with the same dimensions. On one side of the road was a half circle and a stele, evidently a milestone. Around the whole rectangle was a high wall with its base of rubble work between two stone facings, while the upper portion of doubtful height was merely of unbaked bricks. Owing to the poor building material, these walls were enormously thick, over eighty feet. Along the walls were over one hundred and fifty towers, while they were pierced by eight gates, named, as Sargon tells us, after eight great Assyrian deities. Three were used for vehicles. Huge winged bulls with human heads guarded the entrances, above the arch were enameled bricks, while more within were the slabs carved with the figures bearing pine cone and basket. Under each gate, on a bed of sand, was hidden away a large number of cheap trinkets, amulets and the like, while above the roof was vaulted with crude bricks, a piece of work calling for no small skill. Here the peasants would pour in with their produce or sell it in the cool halls, the vender of cooling drinks or of sweetmeats would be there, inquisitive citizens would congregate here to learn the latest news from the front or the latest court gossip. Here, too, were soldiers, and here the judge sat, ready to expose a captive to the jeers of the mob, caged with the wild beasts, or to consign him to a lightless prison hole sunk in the midst of the wall. In some gates, steps in the middle prevented the passage of horses or vehicles. The unfinished state of the city is clearly shown at one gate where there are no bulls, and the inscription is merely painted.

Little has been preserved of the city itself. Its long straight streets crossing at right angles must have seemed very strange to those accustomed to the narrow tortuous lanes common to the older cities. They were paved but had no sidewalks. In general, the effect must have been very monotonous, with the long straight staring brick walls with hardly a break for window or door. Once inside, there must have been more life in the courts, perhaps even gardens, but the whole probably had a decided "made to order at short notice" appearance. There must have been bazaars, temples, and other such buildings, but we have few traces.

The one reason for the existence of the city and the one survival of importance was the palace. This was erected on a platform situated on the line of the west wall and extended partially outside. This platform was no doubt erected primarily in imitation of Babylonian models, but had a more practical justification. It not only formed the part of the city most difficult for an enemy to conquer, it was also a refuge from a revolt which might be feared from the heterogeneous collection of captives who were settled here, if the little body of native Assyrians in the city could not control them. The huge mass was not a mere lump of earth, but was erected of carefully prepared crude bricks with a well-executed drainage system. The pressure of this enormous body was resisted by a retaining wall of huge well-dressed stones, some of which weighed over twenty tons, laid with mathematical regularity. Around the top ran a parapet. How the platform was ascended we do not know, but probably there was access on at least the city side where ramp and perhaps steps were used.

On this platform was a series of buildings, enough to hold the population of a small town, with its fourteen courts and eighty-seven rooms. It was divided into four sections, devoted to servants, to officials, to priests, and to the women, and each of these, with its main court, was subdivided into various groups, each again around its central court. There were two main entrances, each seeming to correspond to an ascent. One was on the side facing the city and was on the style of the city gates, but more elaborate. The center gateway, flanked by its great bulls and adorned with tiling, was reserved for the monarch, while side doors admitted the servants. This led into a large court, the main court of the palace attendants. Around it were store rooms, each with a little cell for its keeper. In them were jars, iron implements, and other supplies, while perhaps some held the treasure. Foodstuffs and drinkables were kept in other rooms in jars

whose pointed ends were placed in supports. A sudden shower showed to astonished workmen wine in some of these jars more than twenty-five centuries old. Nearby were the kitchens where cooking was carried on under nearly the same conditions as today. Jars were turned on one side and arranged in rows. In these was put the fire, while the bread was plastered upon the outside and thus baked. Nearby were the stables and the open courts where the horses were hobbled to rings in the stone pavement. The procuring of these horses for the royal stables was an important matter, and many are the letters relating to it. Two main sources of supply existed. One was Media, whence later the famous Nissaeen horses came, the other was Asia Minor, where, on the Cappadocian plains, a small but sturdy breed was raised. Worthy of special boast were the great horses from Egypt. At this time it would appear the keeper of the royal stables was Nergal etir.

The servants' section was almost completely shut off from the official quarters. The entrance to the latter was, if our conjecture be right, probably from outside the city wall. Entering probably through a still more magnificent gateway, now entirely lost, one came into a court smaller than that of the servants and adorned in the same style but more richly. Around this were the rooms of the officials, each with its broad frieze of sculpture, while the king and his personal attendants lived in simple, unadorned apartments near the center of the platform and retired as much as possible. Here dwelt and worked the officials whom the letters and documents have made known to us.

Skirting along the wall to the southwest, one came to the harem, where resided the ladies of the palace. Its entrance was guarded by two doors, placed at right angles so as to prevent even a glimpse by the passerby of the interior. Once inside, there was a servants' court, a court for state purposes with a statue in the center, with figures of men with slabs on their heads, perhaps intended to bear an awning, with rich tiling, and finally with three elaborate rooms, where probably the king made his visits in state to each of his wives. In addition, there were three separate suites of rooms, each around its own court and entirely isolated from the others. These were clearly for the queens. Two opened on the state court and seem to have belonged to Sargon's wives. The third opened directly on the servant's court. This would seem to be the place for the king's daughter-in-law, the wife of Sennacherib. This was a lady named Naqi'a, apparently from Harran, who also bore the Assyrian name of Zakutu or "Freed", a

reference then to her father-in-law's kindness to her native city. Both as wife of Sennacherib and as mother of Esarhaddon she played a large part, with cities under her control, a large staff, and considerable influence on the course of affairs.

The fourth quarter of the palace enclosure was devoted to the priesthood. Here was the ziggurat, a solid mass of brick nearly one hundred and fifty feet high. Around it ran a ramp with easy ascent and on its top were two altars on which sacrifice was offered to the gods. With its varied colors, each of the seven stories bore the color of the planet to which it was dedicated, and its lofty height, it must have been a most imposing spectacle. Nearby was a temple adorned with reliefs in basalt, but never finished, and other buildings nearby seem to represent the private rooms of the priests. Here were the astrologers, the physicians, and no doubt many of the scribes. An interesting example of a medical test comes to us from this reign. Ishtar duri, governor of Arapha, sends on to the king the two physicians, Nabu shum iddin and Nabu erba, of whom he has spoken. They know nothing of the real state of affairs and are evidently to have their knowledge tested.

We cannot but express our admiration for the architects who produced such splendid results from such poor building material. All around were mountains where building stone might be obtained, and we may wonder why this, though not of a very high quality, was not used. But the Assyrian architects had their reasons. The country north of the Persian Gulf, even so far as Assyria, is exposed to terrible heats in summer, while in winter the winds come from the snow-capped mountains nearby. In summer, clay was even cooler than stone, while it had a warmth in winter never to be expected from the houses of the other material. Each king wished to build for himself, and the use of crude clay offered the quickest means, while its simplicity made it possible to utilize the gangs of prisoners from the foreign conquests. Nor were the architects lacking in skill. Their bricks were fine and large, and as no mortar was used, the mass was homogeneous and there was no danger of settling. The great danger was from the rains. To obviate this, all courts were paved with a double pavement of bricks and with a thick bed of bitumen between, while elaborate drains cut through the platform conducted the water outside, and at the same time connected with an admirable sewer system, the like of which would be a great blessing to the greater part of the East today. They understood the pressure of the material they dealt with and

made the walls thick enough to correspond. To us, with whom sunlight is a necessity and whose work is so largely indoors, the buildings seem inadequately lighted by the doors opening into the courts and by the terracotta fixtures in the roof. But the Assyrian spent the most of his time in the open air, and when he did go inside he wished darkness and coolness, and probably spent the most of his time indoors in sleep. In the evening, he would sleep on the flat roofs, whose dirt roof was kept in smooth shape by the stone rollers so numerous in the ruins. But flat roofs were not all, for the architect had a really marvelous control over the arch and vault. The use of unbaked bricks to form a vault which could remain to our day shows a high degree of ability, as does the use of the half dome in the same crude material for the courts and the formation of the vault by the gradual change of the bricks from the square walls.

It is in connection with the city of Dur Sharrukin that we are enabled to study the art of the period. The troublous times preceding that of Tiglath Pileser III had almost ruined the artistic ability of the nation. But the reign of that monarch marked a change for the better, and with each succeeding reign there was a distinct advance, although this was little after Sargon. The value of the sculptures for the life of the people is immense and has been fully appreciated, but they deserve study from a purely artistic stand-point. The Assyrians rarely sculptured in the round, but a good example may be seen in the standing figure with a plinth on his head who perhaps supported something. Very impressive are the huge winged, man-headed bulls, of which twenty-six were found here, weighing over forty tons each. Only fineness of finish could be gained here, for the general outline, even to the fifth leg, were ordained by the canons of art.

Art found its highest and freest expression in the bas-reliefs which extended in long rows, a mile in all, along the walls of the main rooms in the palace. The beauty of these, whether showing the detail of a campaign or the more peaceful avocations of the chase, is very marked. Sargon's sculptors tried a new experiment in using basalt instead of the too soft alabaster. Before many slabs had been cut, the work was broken off and the workshop with its partially dressed slabs left to be discovered in our own days. In accordance with the usual ancient rule, vivid colors were used to bring out the details.

Painting was also used for inscriptions and for frescoes. Unfortunately, the fact that they were painted on the crude walls has rendered their preservation almost impossible, but many traces of

them have been seen and one or two fragments give us an idea of an art which seems inferior to that displayed on those bas-reliefs where the artist lavished his best efforts.

Far more beautiful was the work in tiling, always a specialty of the east, some of whose finest specimens have been found in the palace of Sargon. On the gates we have courses of enameled bricks where winged figures with the mystic pine cone and basket face each other across a circular ornament, perhaps the sun. The whole is included within rows of conventionalized white and yellow daisies. Other friezes of tiles show conventionalized but vigorous lions, bulls, or eagles, while a rude fig tree and a curious plow, a great contrast to the simple one of today, are also found. But the most interesting are those from the harem, where the king and his tartan, Ashur danin içka, are represented. The king is dressed in a fringed blanket and a sort of jacket, open in front and leaving the right hand free, while the left is held in a sort of sling. His right hand is raised as if giving orders, his left holds the golden scepter, a survival of the rude wooden knobbed stick still used by the peasantry. On his head he wears a golden tiara studded with jewels, much like the modern fez, but with a stiff point instead of the tassel. At the back, a sort of shawl falls nearly to his waist. On his feet are low jeweled sandals with toe thong. The forehead is good, but the broad lips, pronounced nose, large ears, and thick neck seem to show a certain coarseness. His mustache is scanty, but a square-cut beard falls to his breast. His tartan, or prime minister, is dressed much like the king, save for his bare head. He looks older and wears a longer beard. He seems to rest on a spear whose point touches the ground. A careful study of these figures seems to indicate that we have here actual likenesses and very good ones.

The pottery was of an advanced type. In one of the store rooms was found a large quantity of jars, one inside the other, and ranging from pithoi four feet high to pip-kins. But the Assyrians did not need do their best with pottery, for alabaster could be used for the more beautiful vessels, while the Phoenician invention of glass was also utilized. One beautiful and elaborate glass bottle was found in one of the store rooms, the sole unbroken survival of a large collection, while a fine one with Sargon's name cut in it was found at Kalhu. Gem engraving was also still carried on, as the specimens found under the gates testify.

To the classical writers, the Armenian tribes were celebrated for their metal working, but they probably gained all their knowledge

from the Assyrians. Copper was employed alone, although more often as bronze. The fragments of bronze reliefs from the harem, probably used as facing on a wooden door, make us regret the loss of a second Balawat gate set of reliefs, while the bronze lions found at Dur Sharrukin and at Kalhu, give an excellent impression as to the ability of the Assyrians in moulding and casting. These lions, inscribed in both Assyrian and Aramaic, show us the exact weights used in the Assyrian metrology. They also show another very interesting fact. The Assyrians had taken the heavy mina, while Babylonia and Syria preferred the light or Carchemish mina. The other kings simply tolerated this light mina, but Sargon, the conqueror of Carchemish, made it "royal" or official, no doubt in the hope of removing obstacles to trade between Assyria and the West.

The Assyrians, well as they handled copper and bronze, had long ago entered the iron age and it was no doubt to no small degree due to this use of iron both in peace and in war that the success of Assyria was so marked. How much iron was used can be surmised from the fact that one store room at Dur Sharrukin had stored away in it nearly two hundred tons of iron, all worked up in the forms of implements. Among these was a huge iron chain, hammers, pickaxes, mattocks, and plowshare of the same sort as used by the modern natives but of a larger size, some of the picks weighed over twenty-five pounds, and of a finer quality, the peculiar resonance being especially noted. No doubt there were also many fine pieces produced in the precious metals, but these have naturally long ago gone into the melting pot.

The work of building Dur Sharrukin, rush it as the officials might try, was slow, and we have letters in regard to its construction. One, for example, comes from Sha Ashur dubbu, of Tushhan, who reports that his men are now at Dur Sharrukin, and asks that other officials help him guard the timber until it is removed thither. Every campaign brought its quota of spoil for the new city. At last the palace was ready, at least, so it was decided, and the dedication took place, probably in 706. This was celebrated by a sacrifice to the gods and by a great feast in which the princes of the blood royal, the great officials, the scribes sat down.

Sargon's great building venture was never completed, though the city lingered on. One gate is without its bulls, its inscriptions are only painted, and the palace temple is only half finished. The palace itself seems never to have been used thereafter as a royal residence, at least there is no proof of such occupation. But mere natural decay was not

permitted to finish the slow destruction. The successors of Sargon were vandals, and respected the palace of their ancestor no more than they did those of the dynasty they supplanted. Many of the bas-reliefs still in the palace have been mutilated beyond hope of recovery and that by no barbarian's hand, for the mutilation was caused by the chisel of the expert. How many of these were carried away to adorn the palace of Sennacherib at Nineveh or of his successors, we do not know, nor how many were recarved. All we know is that the city lingered on until the end of the Assyrian empire and generally was known as Dur Sharrukin. Then it went to ruin. Even in the Middle Ages, the name Sarghun still lingered, but by this time a new name had come in. Persia had twice held the supremacy of the East and even the second was fast becoming mythical. One of the few names still remembered was Chosroes, and to him was ascribed the ruin under the name of Khorsabad, the "town of Chosroes". So passed the glory of Sargon and for long centuries the only proof that he had lived was the dating of a prophecy by a prophet in a petty western kingdom as having occurred in his reign. And such is the irony of fate that even this was not enough to retain for him his identity, for scholars long continued to believe that he was the same as that Shalmaneser whose throne he had usurped.